



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 117<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 168

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, DECEMBER 8, 2022

No. 191

## House of Representatives

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. TORRES of New York).

### DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,  
December 8, 2022.

I hereby appoint the Honorable RITCHIE TORRES to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,  
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

### PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Margaret Grun Kibben, offered the following prayer:

Receive, O Lord, our best intentions for this day. Receive them, redeem them, and be present in them, that in whatever we do, Your will would be done.

Should we miss the mark, transform our efforts, that they would achieve the best outcomes for the people You have called us to serve. And when we are successful in meeting the expectations we have set for ourselves, set our sights even higher that we would strive to meet the potential You have called us to discover. Then may our work be fruitful and of benefit to Your creation.

In all that we set forth to do, may we heed Your direction and do what You desire for us without grumbling or questioning. But with joy and enthusiasm may we choose to follow Your will for us.

Whatever we do this day—what we eat or drink, what we say or think, where we go and where we are—may it reflect our love for You.

We offer ourselves to You, praying in Your most merciful name.  
Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1 of rule I, the Journal stands approved.

### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentlewoman from Virginia (Ms. SPANBERGER) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. SPANBERGER led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain up to five requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

### NONCITIZEN VETERANS DESERVE PATHWAY TO CITIZENSHIP

(Ms. GARCIA of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. GARCIA of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise to celebrate the passage of the Veteran Service Recognition Act.

Shockingly, many noncitizen veterans have been unjustly deported after honorable service. This is wrong. It is cruel, and it must stop.

Veterans risk their lives to protect our Nation, and now it is up to us to honor their service regardless of their immigration status.

The historic passage of the Veteran Service Recognition Act honors noncitizen veterans and servicemembers by

giving them a fair shot at a pathway to citizenship.

It puts veterans over politics. It honors service over politics. It is fair, and it is the American way. That is why I was so proud to strongly support this bill that passed on Tuesday.

It is now up to the Senate to show noncitizen veterans and servicemembers the respect and dignity they deserve by passing the Veteran Service Recognition Act.

### TCU HORNED FROGS HEADED TO CHAMPIONSHIP GAME

(Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, from given no chance in the preseason polls to making it to the Big 12 championship game, the TCU Horned Frogs have come a long way and are officially headed to the College Football Playoff game.

I am tremendously proud of the team for an incredible season, with 12 consecutive wins, ranking third in the Nation, and making history with being the first team in the State of Texas to make it to the College Football Playoff.

Needless to say, this has been a historic year for TCU, and it could not have been possible without our first-year coach and coach of the year, Sonny Dykes; our quarterback, Max Duggan; all the players and staff who work tirelessly on the sidelines and on the field to make the team one of the best in the country; and most importantly, all the fans, the best in the Nation, who showed up to every game decked out in TCU purple to cheer and support the Horned Frogs.

As a proud alumnus and trustee of the university, I look forward to watching the fighting TCU Horned Frogs take the field on December 31 at the Fiesta Bowl in Phoenix, Arizona.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H8825

As Coach Dykes says, I can't wait to watch you play.

So riff, ram, bah zoo, go Frogs.

In God we trust.

#### CELEBRATING THE LIFE OF THE HONORABLE A. DONALD MCEACHIN

(Ms. SPANBERGER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. SPANBERGER. Mr. Speaker, I stand here today, a day after we celebrated the life of A. DONALD MCEACHIN, to again on the House floor remember the life and legacy of my friend, my mentor, and, as he used to call me, his neighbor. When I was first running for Congress, Mr. McEachin, Donald, used to tell people: I need a new neighbor in Virginia.

I had the privilege of working closely with him, learning from him, and being his friend throughout our service together in Congress and our work across our shared communities.

He was a good man who endeavored to make others feel heard throughout his career, whether he was in the courtroom, in the Virginia General Assembly, or here in Congress.

For decades, he served his community each day with a passion for people, a sense of humor, and an abiding faith in God. He was a relentless advocate for those who needed a voice, our natural resources, and every Virginian.

His passing leaves a hole in the hearts of so many. I will miss my friend, my brother, my mentor, and I stand here on the House floor to give my deepest condolences to his beloved wife, Colette; his wonderful, adored children, Mac, Briana, and Alexandra; and his beloved grandbaby.

He will be missed. We will continue to do right in his memory and in his honor.

#### CONGRATULATING DR. BRIAN TROOP

(Mr. SMUCKER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SMUCKER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Dr. Brian Troop of Ephrata Area School District in Pennsylvania's 11th Congressional District for being selected as the 2023 Pennsylvania Superintendent of the Year by the Pennsylvania Association of School Administrators.

With over 500 districts in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, Dr. Troop's selection speaks to the excellence he brings to Ephrata Area School District.

Dr. Troop was described as an exemplary, forward-thinking leader by PASA Executive Director Dr. Sherri Smith. I would certainly agree with those words.

I have had the pleasure of visiting the school district as a Member of Congress, and I was able to see firsthand the work that they are doing to pre-

pare students in STEM technologies as fifth-grade students were participating in a computer coding project. It was encouraging to see the district offer such an outstanding opportunity to their students.

I thank Dr. Troop for all of his work to provide an excellent education to students in the Ephrata Area School District. I congratulate him on being named the 2023 Pennsylvania Superintendent of the Year.

#### STOP POLITICAL FUNDRAISING SCHEMES

(Ms. PORTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, getting Congress to enact widespread campaign finance reform feels as likely as getting snow in Orange County this Christmas. However, it shouldn't take a once-in-a-century holiday miracle to get Washington to stop political fundraising scams.

Con artists are exploiting loopholes in our election laws by fraudulently misrepresenting themselves as collecting donations meant for causes and candidates. These scam PACs actually use the money to line their own pockets. Worse, they target older Americans and veterans.

As a consumer protection attorney, I will always work to hold fraudsters accountable. With a Republican colleague, I have introduced legislation to help the Federal Election Commission punish these bad actors.

Americans of all political ideologies who participate in our democracy by donating shouldn't have to fear being cheated. I urge passage of my bipartisan bill to stop scam PACs.

#### YOU CAN'T MAKE THIS STUFF UP

(Mr. CLINE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Speaker, American families are ready for a joyous holiday season. Unfortunately, the Biden administration is the grinch that stole Christmas, as its failed Green New Deal agenda is forcing folks to pay record-high costs to heat their homes, fuel their cars, and feed their families.

From diesel to fuel oil, energy prices have skyrocketed. Households will pay an average of \$1,359 on energy bills this winter, the highest in 25 years.

Diesel prices are up 50 percent, and we shouldn't be surprised. President Biden likes to say: "I guarantee you, we are going to end fossil fuel." He has worked with the Pelosi majority to continue to push anti-energy policies.

Just last week, the Biden White House doubled down, saying they are still committed to phasing out fossil fuels. Well, they should look at what is happening over in Europe. After the European Union struck a deal to ban

new fossil fuel cars and speed up the switch to electric vehicles, Switzerland is now going to ban electric vehicles if it faces blackouts this winter. You can't make it up.

It is time for this administration to end its war on American energy. If we are going to regain our energy independence, we need an all-of-the-above approach.

#### HONORING ALBRIGHT COLLEGE'S TOTAL EXPERIENCE LEARNING MODEL

(Ms. HOULAHAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. HOULAHAN. Mr. Speaker, as students across this country are readying to take their finals and midterms, I want to recognize Albright College's work to innovate education in the United States.

Albright's Total Experience Learning Dual Enrollment program lets high school juniors and seniors enroll in college courses and allows them to complete an entire semester of coursework before they even begin college. As a former high school chemistry teacher and leader of a literacy nonprofit myself, I am so proud of this successful program.

Next week, the president of Albright College will be at the United Nations, where Albright will be recognized by a science subcommittee of the United Nations as the innovative K-12 educator model for the United Nations International Year of Glass.

Without a doubt, the students and staff of Albright's Total Experience Learning are force multipliers, and it is my honor to represent and support all the forward-thinking constituents, businesses, and academic institutions like Albright within our Sixth Congressional District.

#### HIGHLIGHTING HELLS CANYON COLLABORATIVE

(Mr. FULCHER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FULCHER. Mr. Speaker, our country is blessed with abundant natural resources that are the envy of the world. The governance of those resources is the responsibility of all of us to make our outdoor spaces manageable and accessible for enjoyment of all.

I am pleased to highlight the Hells Canyon Recreation Collaborative in my home State of Idaho. This collaborative was formed in December 2016 after a fee for boaters was proposed on the Snake River through Hells Canyon. Rafters, jet boaters, aviators, motorized recreation users, and others came together for its formation. As a 501(c)(3), they identified and raised separate resources so access could be maintained without a user fee increase.

Additionally, the collaborative was able to build boat rigs, complete the building of administrative and recreation facilities for the Forest Service and an airstrip for aviators, as well as provide road maintenance for administrative sites.

I am so proud to highlight the men and women who stepped up and made a difference for the benefit of all in the Hells Canyon river area. I look forward to hearing about more good work from them.

□ 0915

#### CONGRESS MUST ADDRESS THE DEBT CEILING

(Mr. LEVIN of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LEVIN of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address a looming crisis facing our country. This one is a man-made crisis, one born out of cruel political calculations.

Mr. Speaker, I am referring to the threat of some of our Republican colleagues to refuse to raise the debt ceiling next year, unless their most extreme demands are met, and they have made clear what those demands are.

They believe this threat is how they can finally force cuts to the Social Security benefits that millions of Americans have earned. This threat is how they are going try to raise the retirement age. This is how they want to force cuts to Medicare.

They are prepared to force a default and create catastrophic consequences for our economy and America's standing in the world, so they can slash Social Security and Medicare.

We can't let that happen. We must address the debt ceiling. The consequences if we don't act are too grave.

To all of my colleagues, we must not hold Social Security and Medicare hostage. We must address the debt ceiling as soon as possible.

#### HONORING THE LIFE OF DAVID "WALLY" WALLER

(Mr. C. SCOTT FRANKLIN of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. C. SCOTT FRANKLIN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of David "Wally" Waller, a Polk County, Florida, native who passed away last month at the age of 67 following a courageous battle with cancer.

Wally was a hero to our community in more ways than one, beginning with his 25-year career in law enforcement. After retiring, he became a hero to countless children while serving as program coordinator for the U.S. Marine Corps Reserve's Toys for Tots program.

Under Wally's leadership, Polk County's Toys for Tots was named the top program in the United States last year

with more than 57,000 toys collected for over 14,000 children. Those who volunteered with him said he was the heart and soul of Toys for Tots, a title he richly deserved.

On behalf of our community, thank you, Wally and "Well done, thy good and faithful servant."

#### RESPECT FOR MARRIAGE ACT

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1510, I call up the bill (H.R. 8404) to repeal the Defense of Marriage Act and ensure respect for State regulation of marriage, and for other purposes, with the Senate amendment thereto, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the Senate amendment.

Senate amendment:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

##### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Respect for Marriage Act".

##### SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) No union is more profound than marriage, for it embodies the highest ideals of love, fidelity, devotion, sacrifice, and family.

(2) Diverse beliefs about the role of gender in marriage are held by reasonable and sincere people based on decent and honorable religious or philosophical premises. Therefore, Congress affirms that such people and their diverse beliefs are due proper respect.

(3) Millions of people, including interracial and same-sex couples, have entered into marriages and have enjoyed the rights and privileges associated with marriage. Couples joining in marriage deserve to have the dignity, stability, and ongoing protection that marriage affords to families and children.

##### SEC. 3. REPEAL OF SECTION ADDED TO TITLE 28, UNITED STATES CODE, BY SECTION 2 OF THE DEFENSE OF MARRIAGE ACT.

Section 1738C of title 28, United States Code, is repealed.

##### SEC. 4. FULL FAITH AND CREDIT GIVEN TO MARRIAGE EQUALITY.

Chapter 115 of title 28, United States Code, as amended by this Act, is further amended by inserting after section 1738B the following:

##### "§1738C. Certain acts, records, and proceedings and the effect thereof

"(a) IN GENERAL.—No person acting under color of State law may deny—

"(1) full faith and credit to any public act, record, or judicial proceeding of any other State pertaining to a marriage between 2 individuals, on the basis of the sex, race, ethnicity, or national origin of those individuals; or

"(2) a right or claim arising from such a marriage on the basis that such marriage would not be recognized under the law of that State on the basis of the sex, race, ethnicity, or national origin of those individuals.

"(b) ENFORCEMENT BY ATTORNEY GENERAL.—The Attorney General may bring a civil action in the appropriate United States district court against any person who violates subsection (a) for declaratory and injunctive relief.

"(c) PRIVATE RIGHT OF ACTION.—Any person who is harmed by a violation of subsection (a) may bring a civil action in the appropriate United States district court against the person who violated such subsection for declaratory and injunctive relief.

"(d) STATE DEFINED.—In this section, the term 'State' has the meaning given such term under section 7 of title 1."

##### SEC. 5. MARRIAGE RECOGNITION.

Section 7 of title 1, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

##### "§ 7. Marriage

"(a) For the purposes of any Federal law, rule, or regulation in which marital status is a factor, an individual shall be considered married if that individual's marriage is between 2 individuals and is valid in the State where the marriage was entered into or, in the case of a marriage entered into outside any State, if the marriage is between 2 individuals and is valid in the place where entered into and the marriage could have been entered into in a State.

"(b) In this section, the term 'State' means a State, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, or any other territory or possession of the United States.

"(c) For purposes of subsection (a), in determining whether a marriage is valid in a State or the place where entered into, if outside of any State, only the law of the jurisdiction applicable at the time the marriage was entered into may be considered."

##### SEC. 6. NO IMPACT ON RELIGIOUS LIBERTY AND CONSCIENCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Nothing in this Act, or any amendment made by this Act, shall be construed to diminish or abrogate a religious liberty or conscience protection otherwise available to an individual or organization under the Constitution of the United States or Federal law.

(b) GOODS OR SERVICES.—Consistent with the First Amendment to the Constitution, nonprofit religious organizations, including churches, mosques, synagogues, temples, nondenominational ministries, interdenominational and ecumenical organizations, mission organizations, faith-based social agencies, religious educational institutions, and nonprofit entities whose principal purpose is the study, practice, or advancement of religion, and any employee of such an organization, shall not be required to provide services, accommodations, advantages, facilities, goods, or privileges for the solemnization or celebration of a marriage. Any refusal under this subsection to provide such services, accommodations, advantages, facilities, goods, or privileges shall not create any civil claim or cause of action.

##### SEC. 7. STATUTORY PROHIBITION.

(a) NO IMPACT ON STATUS AND BENEFITS NOT ARISING FROM A MARRIAGE.—Nothing in this Act, or any amendment made by this Act, shall be construed to deny or alter any benefit, status, or right of an otherwise eligible entity or person which does not arise from a marriage, including tax-exempt status, tax treatment, educational funding, or a grant, contract, agreement, guarantee, loan, scholarship, license, certification, accreditation, claim, or defense.

(b) NO FEDERAL RECOGNITION OF POLYGAMOUS MARRIAGES.—Nothing in this Act, or any amendment made by this Act, shall be construed to require or authorize Federal recognition of marriages between more than 2 individuals.

##### SEC. 8. SEVERABILITY.

If any provision of this Act, or any amendment made by this Act, or the application of such provision to any person, entity, government, or circumstance, is held to be unconstitutional, the remainder of this Act, or any amendment made thereby, or the application of such provision to all other persons, entities, governments, or circumstances, shall not be affected thereby.

##### MOTION TO CONCUR

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. Nadler of New York moves that the House concur in the Senate amendment to H.R. 8404.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1510, the motion shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

The gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JORDAN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on H.R. 8404.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Senate amendment to H.R. 8404, the Respect for Marriage Act. I first introduced a version of this legislation in 2009, and I am very proud that after a long journey it will soon be headed to the President's desk and marriage equality will be enshrined in law.

The House took an important step in July when it passed the bill with the support of 47 Republican Members. Now that the Senate has passed an amended version, also with bipartisan support, it is up to us to finish the job.

I find it deeply poignant that as we prepare to bring the 117th Congress to a close, we are on the cusp of a great bipartisan moral victory in defense of a fundamental right of all Americans, a victory that will provide stability and reassurance to the millions of LGBTQ and interracial families that have come to rely on the constitutional right to marry.

The Respect for Marriage Act does three things: First, it repeals the so-called Defense of Marriage Act, which blatantly discriminates against same-sex couples, and which still officially remains on the books.

Second, it enshrines marriage equality for Federal law purposes, requiring the Federal Government to consider a person to be married if the marriage is valid in the State where it was performed.

Finally, it prohibits anyone acting under color of State law from denying full legal effect to a valid out-of-state marriage based on the sex, race, ethnicity, or national origin of the two individuals in the marriage.

The Senate amendment does not change any of these substantive provisions. Rather, it adds language that explicitly affirms that existing constitutional and other legal protections for religious liberty remain in effect. The Senate amendment does not create any new substantive legal rights, but rather, it clarifies that the bill does not affect the existing legal rights or benefits of religious persons or entities. It also explicitly clarifies that the bill

does not require or authorize the Federal Government to recognize polygamous marriages.

It is because of this compromise—the result of the hard work of Senators TAMMY BALDWIN and SUSAN COLLINS—that the amended bill passed the Senate by a vote of 61–36 with 12 Republican Senators voting in support.

While marriage equality remains constitutionally protected today, we have learned in recent months that rights once thought to be fundamental and forever secure can, in fact, be taken away. Indeed, in the Supreme Court's decision in *Dobbs v. Jackson Women's Health Organization*—a decision overturning nearly 50 years of precedent recognizing a constitutional right to abortion—Justice Clarence Thomas went out of his way to write a separate concurrence calling on the Court to reconsider all of its substantive due process decisions, including *Obergefell v. Hodges*, the decision recognizing a right to marriage equality.

In light of this concurrence, even if one accepts the *Dobbs* majority's assurances that the constitutional right to marriage equality is settled law, Congress must use this opportunity to provide additional reassurance to the many American families who have come to rely on this guarantee. After all, we were told that the right to abortion was settled law.

The Respect for Marriage Act cements respect for married couples, which all Americans—including those in this Congress—should support and value.

I thank the co-chairs of the LGBTQ+ Equality Caucus, the chairs of the Congressional Tri-Caucus, and incoming House Democratic leader HAKEEM JEFFRIES for joining me in introducing this legislation. I also thank my chief of staff, Amy Rutkin, who helped to do so much to guide this legislation through the House.

I urge all Members to support this Senate amendment to H.R. 8404, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the Democrats want Americans to believe that the Supreme Court at any moment—in fact, the chairman just referenced this—at any moment could step in and overturn its opinions in *Obergefell* and *Loving*. It is just not true. The Supreme Court is not poised to overturn its opinions in either of those decisions.

Just look at what the Court has said. The *Dobbs* opinion does not undermine other substantive due process rights in any way. Just in case anyone is not clear on the meaning of does not undermine them in any way, the Court later reiterated that the *Dobbs* decision should not be misunderstood or mischaracterized “... to cast doubt on precedents that do not concern abortion.”

The Court condemned the alarmist idea that the *Dobbs* decision would lead

to the overturning of other cases as “perhaps . . . designed to stoke unfounded fear that our decision will imperil those other rights . . .”

It is that unfounded fear that brings us here today.

Democrats have conjured up this nonexistent threat based on one line in Justice Thomas' concurrence in *Dobbs*, and they are misunderstanding or deliberately misrepresenting what Justice Thomas wrote.

Justice Thomas made the same point that he has made for years: that the collection of rights secured by the doctrine of substantive due process is better understood as being a function of the Constitution's privileges and immunities clause. That is it.

From his statement that a body of law should flow from one place in the Constitution instead of another comes the hyperbolic arguments that we have heard about the necessity of this bill.

After the House last considered this bill in July, the Senate was forced to make significant changes to the bill. Unfortunately, those changes do not go far enough in protecting religious liberty.

For example, the Senate amendment does not protect a private entity that is determined to be a State actor as a result of the services they provide on behalf of a government. These entities could be adoption agencies, shelters, or other service providers operated by a religious organization under contract with a city or State.

Across the country, people of faith serve their neighbors and their communities through these charitable efforts, but this bill could force them to abandon their faith or abandon the service. That is an unacceptable outcome in the United States.

For years, the Democrats have been playing a dangerous game with the Court. They want Americans to believe that the Court lacks transparency and struggles with its ethics. That is simply not true.

This bill is simply the latest installment of the Democrat's campaign to intimidate the highest court in our land. They have engaged in a smear campaign against sitting Justices and nominees. Democrats have stood on the steps of the Court and threatened Justices by name for not ruling the way they want in high-profile cases. Democrat members of the Judiciary Committee, including the chairman, have introduced a bill to pack the Court; to add four Justices to our highest court—not one, not two, not three, but four, because they simply want to take it over.

Democrats have held hearings to showcase fringe legal and conspiracy theories about the Court and its rulings.

In fact, later today, the Judiciary Committee will hold a hearing to again suggest that the Court has somehow been compromised based on a totally unsubstantiated allegation that Justice Alito leaked information 8 years

ago about an opinion in the Hobby Lobby case.

There is just one problem: Justice Alito denies this allegation. The individual who allegedly was the conduit for the leak denies it ever happened. Even the media admits there are holes in the story.

Politico said this:

We spent several months attempting to corroborate the allegation but was unable to locate anyone who heard about the decision directly from Alito or his wife before the release of the case.

The New York Times reported that there are “gaps” in the allegation. The New York Times is the one who broke the story. They reported there are gaps in this allegation about a leak from Justice Alito 8 years ago. Gaps in an allegation.

Do you know what that is? That is liberal-speak for that story doesn’t add up. But the Democrats are determined to not let the truth get in the way of their story and their intimidation tactics on the Court.

This is not the way we are supposed to operate. I hope that we can vote this bill down. I hope it does not pass because I think it is dangerous and takes the country in the wrong direction.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE).

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, today we will vote for equality and against discrimination by finally overturning the exclusionary, homophobic Defense of Marriage Act and guaranteeing crucial protections for same-sex and interracial marriages.

By passing the Respect for Marriage Act, we will ensure that all Americans continue to be afforded the same rights by the government—no matter what the Supreme Court may decide in the future.

As we take this vote, we can take pride in the progress that we have made but also must acknowledge the work that lies ahead.

The idea of marriage equality used to be a farfetched idea; now it is the law of the land and supported by the vast majority of Americans. Marriage bans used to be a partisan tool. Now, the Respect for Marriage Act has received strong bipartisan votes in both Chambers.

Protecting marriage equality is now a bipartisan idea that I hope all my colleagues will embrace. I urge all those here today who previously voted against this bill to reconsider, be part of history, and join us in voting for its passage today.

Today’s vote is a monumental win in the fight for LGBTQ+ equality, but the work does not stop here. We remain the only minority group in America where in a majority of States it is still legal to discriminate against us in several key areas of life.

We must continue to work for full equality for the LGBTQ+ community,

including by enacting additional protections at the State level and finally passing the Equality Act to ensure explicit Federal protections against anti-LGBTQ+ discrimination.

I want to end by thanking Chairman NADLER for his extraordinary leadership. He has been a champion of this bill for more than 13 years. I was proud to join him and others in introducing the Respect for Marriage Act again this Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote “yes,” vote for equality, and vote to be certain that we live in a country where all Americans have equal access to the important institution of marriage.

□ 0930

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from the great State of Missouri (Mrs. HARTZLER).

Mrs. HARTZLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to adamantly oppose H.R. 8404, the disrespect for marriage act. This unnecessary and misguided legislation not only disrespects the importance of traditional marriage for the health of a family, but also disrespects people and organizations of faith who have the constitutional right to carry out their mission in accordance with their most deeply held beliefs.

With a crisis at the border, inflation skyrocketing, and a Federal budget that is nowhere to be seen just a week before Christmas, Democrats have made it abundantly clear that this disrespectful policy is their priority.

Let’s be clear: Obergefell is not in danger, but people and institutions of faith are.

This bill only serves to further demonize biblical values by establishing a private right of action against organizations who believe in natural marriage, opening the floodgates for predatory lawsuits against people of faith. The bill’s only purpose is to hand the Federal Government a legal bludgeoning tool to drive people of faith out of the public square and to silence anyone who dissents.

Sadly, the Senate rejected three amendments that would have eliminated the private right of action and prevented the government from infringing on the freedom of religion.

Instead, a flimsy amendment that includes vague language unlikely to protect anyone was included.

Unfortunately, and likely intentionally, this hollow amendment provides no tangible protections for religious schools, no protections for faith-based adoption and foster care agencies, no protections for Christian businesses who contract with the government, and no protections for civil servants who justly believe marriage is between one man and one woman.

The bill’s implications: submit to our ideology or be silenced.

This is yet another step toward the Democrats’ goal of dismantling the traditional family, silencing voices of

faith, and permanently undoing our country’s God-woven foundation. This is the Democrats’ priority.

Mr. Speaker, I will tell you my priority: Protect religious liberty, protect people of faith, and protect Americans who believe in the true meaning of marriage.

I hope and pray that my colleagues will find the courage to join me in opposing this misguided and dangerous bill.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. ALLRED).

Mr. ALLRED. Mr. Speaker, first, I want to say that we received amazing news this morning. Brittney Griner is coming home.

This is a huge relief for her, her wife, Chelle, and her family after months of uncertainty in Russia’s sham justice system. I thank President Biden, Secretary Blinken, and all at the State Department who made this happen.

Today, in a strong symbol of the stark differences in the freedoms between our two Nations, the U.S. Congress will vote in a bipartisan way to pass the Respect for Marriage Act enshrining marriage equality into Federal law and protecting marriages just like Brittney’s.

I am proud to vote today to say that love is love no matter who you are or where you live and no matter what any future extreme or out-of-touch Supreme Court may say.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to join me in voting “yes” and standing up for freedom.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from the great State of Virginia (Mr. GOOD).

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to the so-called Respect for Marriage Act. Honestly, this bill should be called the disrespect for marriage act.

This bill certainly disrespects God’s definition of marriage, a definition that has served His creation well for more than 5,000 years of recorded history. And His definition is the only one that really matters.

This bill would codify into Federal law the Supreme Court’s wrongly decided Obergefell decision and ensure that the marriage laws in the most liberal State—irrespective of how more radical they might become in the future, think polygamy, bestiality, child marriage, or whatever—must be legally recognized in all States.

It was wrong when the Supreme Court made law in the Obergefell decision requiring that the marriage law in Massachusetts had to become the law of the whole country when Massachusetts approved gay marriage.

This was overriding the will of the people and their elected Representatives as no other State to that point had been able to pass through referendum or State legislature a gay marriage law.

The fact is that traditional, biblical marriage is the foundation of a strong society and a strong culture.

I will say it once again: almost everything that plagues our society is a failure to follow God's design for marriage, morality, and the family. The perfect, omniscient, and immutable God knows what He is doing.

But this legislation repeals the correct definition of marriage in Federal code and requires the Federal Government to recognize any marriage if the marriage was valid in the State where it was performed.

Perhaps even worse, this bill eliminates all religious freedom protections for churches or other faith-based organizations and requires everyone to participate in and recognize gay marriage.

It empowers the IRS with their newly hired 87,000 agents who apparently need something to do to go after the religious institutions that simply seek to operate according to their beliefs. In fact, the bill does nothing to prevent the IRS from attacking and harming the religious organizations that have made an incredible impact in our communities across our Nation.

It is simply designed to undermine marriage as a union between one man and one woman. God's perfect design is, indeed, marriage between one man and one woman for life, and it doesn't matter what you think or what I think. That is what the Bible says.

This proposal is yet another Democrat attempt to undermine the fundamental values which formed our Nation and continue to hold our country together: recognition of the institution of marriage as between one man and one woman and respect for the freedom to operate according to your sincerely held religious beliefs.

The legislation we are considering today is a sobering indication of the erosion of the moral values that made this Nation great.

As President Reagan once said: "America is great because America is good, and if America ever ceases to be good, America will cease to be great."

All great nations in societies fall from within. With Democrats threatening all sense of values and decency and family today by sexualizing kids in school, redefining sex and gender, and trans-surgery and mutilation of minors, it makes no sense for any Republican to support their efforts to codify their views on marriage.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all my colleagues in this body to join me in strongly opposing this bill.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. POCAN).

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Speaker, it is never too late to do the right thing. Thanks to bipartisan work in the Senate, the Respect for Marriage Act comes back to the House with added language that should allay anyone's fears or misunderstandings, yet still ensure we can legally recognize marriage as it is currently recognized in this country.

It would be wrong to say that my husband, Phil, and I have a marriage that is any different from anyone else's

marriage here in this body. My workplace health insurance should extend to my husband just like yours extends to your spouse. I should be able to visit my husband in the hospital, if need be, just like you can visit your spouse. My earned benefits for retirement, Social Security, our property rights, our benefits through our taxes, and so much more should be no different, regardless of if your spouse is named Samuel or Samantha.

That is what we will do today. With the revised Respect for Marriage Act, denying legal recognition to any legally married couple would be so far out of the mainstream that it would actually be discrimination. I am sure no one here would intend to discriminate against me and my spouse, as I would never against you and yours.

Mr. Speaker, I urge everyone's support for this bill.

Mr. JORDAN. I reserve the balance of my time, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO).

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Respect for Marriage Act. Over my time in Congress as the first openly gay Member of color elected in history, the fight for LGBTQ equality has remained a critical and personal focus of mine. Last week, the Senate took long-overdue action to repeal the Defense of Marriage Act, and when my colleagues and I pass the Respect for Marriage Act in the House today, it will mean the world to me, my loved ones, and to millions of Americans.

Nearly 10 years ago, at the start of my career in Congress, the Supreme Court ruled in *Obergefell v. Hodges* that marriage equality is a fundamental protected right. We took to the streets in fervent celebration of this cornerstone victory for our community.

This bill will pass today, but it is a reminder of the necessity of our vigilance in the fight for human rights and the need to hold the judicial branch accountable. We must rise to the challenge, and we will prevail.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from the great State of Michigan (Mr. WALBERG).

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to what I believe is the inappropriately named Respect for Marriage Act because if what my colleagues have just said were actually all that was here, it would be a different story to some degree. But that is not what we are talking about.

The bill betrays our country's commitment to the fundamental right of religious liberty by depriving religious and faith-based organizations of their tax-exempt status and depriving individual people of faith of being able to carry out fully their faith without repercussions. Licenses and government contracts are also put at risk here with this legislation.

As a result, religiously affiliated and faith-based organizations will be at risk of being compelled to make hiring decisions in contradiction to their tenets. And I am not just talking about Christian religions. We are talking about all that are impacted by this.

It puts us at risk for Catholic Charities' ability to find foster and adoptive homes for children in need; or a gospel rescue mission's ability to serve the homeless; and it would likely be the end of the school choice initiatives that rely on religious schools—schools of faith—to serve at-risk children trapped in failing schools. Additionally, businessowners across the country who conduct their businesses based on their sincerely held faith, beliefs, and principles would be subject to lawsuits simply because they have a traditional view of marriage.

Again, if all that my colleagues have just even recently said were the only thing about this legislation, it would be another story; but it isn't, it goes way beyond. A deep appreciation for and commitment to following science in the positive endeavor of continuing the human race is important.

Mr. Speaker, I ask for opposition to this legislation and a more thoughtful approach.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota (Ms. CRAIG).

Ms. CRAIG. Mr. Speaker, my wife, Cheryl, and I were married 14 years ago when one of the first States in our country allowed us to do so. It took years and a Supreme Court ruling to acknowledge and grant the legal protections that come with marriage across this great land. In the ensuing years, we raised our four sons, and we expanded our family of six to nine, adding two daughters-in-law and a grandson to that mix.

I am standing here today because in the year 2022, families like mine are, once again, concerned that an activist, out-of-step Supreme Court is going to take those rights away. Just so we are clear, that Supreme Court and the Members in opposition of this legislation today are out of step with the American people.

Today, I urge all of my colleagues to vote "yes" on the Respect for Marriage Act, a bill that takes the longstanding and overdue step of repealing DOMA and ensures that same-sex and interracial marriage is recognized in every State, no matter who is sitting on the Supreme Court.

We have made progress. Mr. Speaker, let's not go back.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I would just first say, the previous speaker talked about being out of step with the American people.

Are you kidding me?

The Democrats are the party who think men can use women's restrooms; the Democrats are the party who think boys can participate in girls' sports; the Democrats are the party who think you can take the life of an unborn child



right up until their birthday; and the Democrats are the party who actually had a witness in committee who said that she thought men could get pregnant.

And we are the ones who are out of step?

You have got to be kidding me.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from the great State of Florida (Mr. MAST).

Mr. MAST. Mr. Speaker, what is our job here?

We are going to take an oath in a couple of weeks here really outlining our job: supporting and defending the Constitution of the United States of America against all enemies foreign and domestic.

I took that oath as a member of the military; I have taken that oath numerous times as member of the U.S. House of Representatives. The U.S. House of Representatives, a bicameral body, 435 of us, are meant to do the work of protecting we the people of the United States of America who elect us, and I want to quote our colleague on the other side, Ms. SCANLON, who was talking about what we don't have time for here as our colleague, CHIP ROY, was asking for amendments to ensure that we the people's religious freedom was not prohibited, that the free exercise thereof was not prohibited.

□ 0945

Adopting an amendment by our colleague, CHIP ROY, she said, would unsettle the Senate. God forbid the work that we do here in the House of Representatives unsettles the work that is done in the Senate. Our job must be to just do their bidding of what they decide in the Senate and not represent as 1 of 435.

But, no, that is not the real case. Our job is to represent our constituents, we the people, not to worry about whether we unsettle or don't unsettle the Senate.

Let me give you another quote from our colleague about why we don't have the time to prohibit or to prevent prohibiting the free exercise thereof. She said that this Congress is coming to a close, and we don't have time to make changes to this legislation.

We don't have the time? Wait a second. In the U.S. House of Representatives, our oath is to support and defend the Constitution of the United States of America. It is our singular job here, and we don't have the time to do it?

That is what the majority is telling us: We don't have time to make changes to the bill, to ensure that the free exercise thereof, of our people's religions, is not infringed upon. They are saying we don't have time.

What the hell are we doing here if we don't have the time to do it? What the hell are we doing?

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), a member of the committee.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, why are we here this morning? We are

here because dignity should be part of life in America. We are here because the Founding Fathers, imperfect as they were, said we are here to create a more perfect union.

We are specifically here because a Justice on the United States Supreme Court, Justice Clarence Thomas, appallingly stated that other cherished, fundamental rights should be subject to abrogation, writing: "In future cases, we should reconsider all of this Court's substantive due process precedents, including *Griswold*, *Lawrence*, and *Obergefell*."

It is shameful that we would have to be here today, but I proudly stand with my community, those who understand and recognize that it is crucial for the Respect for Marriage Act to pass so that respect can go for the loving relationships, the families, the daughters, the sons, the aunts and uncles, and all the husbands and wives that come as family.

Let me be very clear: I am the only Member in the Texas delegation that voted against the Defense of Marriage Act. I voted against it.

DOMA was wrong then, it is wrong now, and I continuously stand with all of you to pass H.R. 8404, the Respect for Marriage Act.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to rise in strong support for H.R. 8404, the "Respect for Marriage Act" and the collaboration in the Senate last week that enabled it to pass the Senate and return to the House for today's vote.

I am very concerned that the archaic dictum that the Supreme Court used in *Dobbs v. Jackson Women's Health Organization* to justify overturning the well-established and reaffirmed right to abortion could be further weaponized in the future to strip away other fundamental rights, including the right to marriage equality.

Specifically, in his concurring opinion to the *Dobbs* decision, Clarence Thomas appallingly stated that other cherished, fundamental rights should be subject to abrogation, writing, "... in future cases, we should reconsider all of this Court's substantive due process precedents, including *Griswold*, *Lawrence*, and *Obergefell*."

Thomas left no doubt about his regressive, byzantine intentions, adding, "... we have a duty to 'correct the error' established in those precedents, *Gamble v. United States*, 587 U.S. \_\_\_\_ (2019) (THOMAS, J., concurring) (slip op., at 9). After overruling these demonstrably erroneous decisions, the question would remain whether other constitutional provisions guarantee the myriad rights that our substantive due process cases have generated."

To prevent Thomas's dream scenario from inflicting a nightmare on the rest of the country, the Respect for Marriage Act would codify in federal law our essential rights conferring marriage equality for same sex and interracial couples, protecting the rights of Americans to marry who they choose.

It would also repeal the discriminatory Defense of Marriage Act (DOMA) of 1996 that problematically defined marriage as being between one man and one woman.

I am always concerned when someone's rights are being infringed, which is why I

wholeheartedly supported the version of this bill that passed the House earlier this year.

Even with the Senate amendment, I still recognize the great strides that will be achieved with passage of this bill in its current form. The Senate's embrace of this legislation, with strong bipartisan support, demonstrates the bill's alignment with bedrock American values and its strong support among the American people, across political ideologies.

After witnessing the Senate's passage of the Respect for Marriage Act, I am proud to say that we are on a path to guaranteeing marriage equality for every American.

The Supreme Courts' rulings in *Loving v. Virginia*, and *Obergefell v. Hodges* were founded on the promise of unenumerated rights and due process for all American people as guaranteed in the 9th and 14th amendments of our nation's Constitution.

The 9th Amendment states that the federal government does not retain final authority over rights not listed in the Constitution—which, in effect, includes the right to marry someone regardless of their sex or race. That very personal and intimate right is retained by the people.

Additionally, the 14th Amendment ensures that no right afforded to the American people can be taken away without due process of law, while also guaranteeing to all Americans that they shall have equal protection under the law.

The same law that applies to a Black man wishing to marry a Hispanic woman must be applied equally to an Indigenous woman wishing to marry a White woman, a nonbinary individual wishing to marry a man, and so on.

That is the Constitutional promise in the United States.

Marriage Equality is not a right that can be stripped away by a conservative faction of the United States Supreme Court, nor by extremist Republican legislators.

It is a fundamental aspect of our democracy.

The assurances of the 14th Amendment became part of our national governing documents as a protection against those who would use their power to wipe away the freedoms of others without restraint or consent of the governed.

It is unfortunate that we must rely on its strength again today.

We cannot and will not allow Republican lawmakers and conservative Justices to continue to toy with the rights of the American people.

That is why I strongly support the Respect for Marriage Act and commend my friends in the Senate for garnering bipartisan support for this act.

This Act would ensure that an individual be considered married as long as the marriage was valid in the state where it was performed.

This ensures that same-sex and interracial couples would continue to enjoy equal treatment under federal law—as the Constitution requires.

This bill would go further by officially repealing the Defense of Marriage Act.

While the Supreme Court effectively rendered DOMA inert with its decision in *Obergefell*, this unconstitutional and discriminatory law still officially remains on the books.

H.R. 8404 would repeal DOMA once and for all.

The Respect for Marriage Act would also prohibit any person acting under color of state

law from denying full faith and credit to an out-of-state marriage based on the sex, race, ethnicity or national origin of those in the marriage.

It would also authorize the U.S. Attorney General to enforce these protections and would allow recourse for any person harmed by a violation of this provision.

We will not back down from demanding marriage equality.

We will not back down from demanding racial justice.

We will not back down from demanding equal rights for all of the American people.

I strongly support H.R. 8404, the Respect for Marriage Act, and encourage my colleagues to pass this bill.

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. CHU).

Ms. CHU. Madam Speaker, I rise today to give my strongest support for the Respect for Marriage Act.

It is hard to believe that today, in 2022, we are still fighting to protect the right of all Americans to marry the person they love.

The Supreme Court's actions this summer have shown us that we cannot take our rights for granted. No one should have to live in fear that a Supreme Court decision could invalidate their marriage in the blink of an eye.

The Respect for Marriage Act enshrines the right to marry the person you love, regardless of gender, race, or identity, into Federal law.

It finally repeals the discriminatory Defense of Marriage Act from our lawbooks, and it reaffirms our commitment to a promise of equality for all by ensuring critical Federal and State protections for same-sex and interracial marriages.

I have spent my career fighting for the rights of the LGBTQ+ community, both at the State and Federal levels, and so I am proud to stand on the House floor today in support of the Respect for Marriage Act.

Sending this bill to the President's desk sends a powerful message that love is love, that family is family, and that this Congress stands together against hate and discrimination.

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. GARCIA), a member of the committee.

Ms. GARCIA of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise today to support people's right to love and their equal protection under the law. The Respect for Marriage Act will reaffirm marriage equality as the law of the land.

All Americans, no matter who they are and who they love, deserve dignity and equal treatment under the law.

Madam Speaker, back home in my State of Texas, people are literally scared. Entire families are considering fleeing Texas for fear of what the MAGA GOP will do to their partners and their loved ones.

Earlier this year, the far-right Texas GOP declared homosexuality as an abnormal lifestyle choice in their official platform. Yes, they put it in their platform.

Last month, Texas Republicans pre-filed 17 bills targeting the LGBTQ+ community for our next legislative session in Texas.

To my LGBTQ constituents and neighbors back home, know that I am here for you. House Democrats will not waver in our fight for human dignity and equality under the law.

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. PAPPAS).

Mr. PAPPAS. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the Respect for Marriage Act.

Growing up in New Hampshire as a gay person, I wasn't sure if there would be a place for me or if I would be able to have a family of my own. I was lucky to be surrounded by people who embraced me for who I am and to live at a time when hearts, minds, and laws were changing for the better.

Next year, I will marry the love of my life. It is unthinkable that if the Supreme Court heeds Justice Thomas' call that our marriage might be recognized in New Hampshire where we live but not across the country.

That is the reality that many couples fear, one that will jeopardize their ability to visit a spouse in the hospital or access all the benefits that couples do, one that would strip millions of Americans of their rights and their dignity.

That is a threat that we can't ignore. I hope my colleagues will heed the calls of their constituents and the call of history and cast a vote in favor of the Respect for Marriage Act to say that love is love and to respect people's individual freedoms in this country.

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. CROW).

Mr. CROW. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 8404, the Respect for Marriage Act, a bill to ensure critical protections for same-sex and interracial marriages.

Madam Speaker, 19 days ago, Coloradans woke up to the news of yet another mass shooting impacting our community. This violence was the direct result of intolerance and discrimination. It was the direct result of efforts by some elected officials to seize on hate and villainize the LGBTQ+ community.

Today, we have the opportunity to reject the ugly vitriol and stand with the LGBTQ+ community in Colorado and nationwide. Today, we have the opportunity to protect all Americans, regardless of how they identify or whom they love.

The Respect for Marriage Act will uphold marriage equality under Fed-

eral law, repealing the discriminatory Defense of Marriage Act. This bill ensures that the Federal Government won't stand in the way of a person's right to marry whom they love.

I thank Chairman NADLER for leading this effort and the Congressional Equality Caucus for their ongoing work to promote equality for all, regardless of gender identity or sexual orientation.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this bill.

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. TORRES).

Mr. TORRES of New York. Madam Speaker, I dedicate my remarks to two civil rights icons, Edith and Judith Windsor.

Today, we repeal the Defense of Marriage Act, which degraded marriage under the pretense of defending it. Today, we put the equality of same-sex love in its rightful place under the protection of Federal law.

We will not leave it to the forces of hate and the relics of the past to be the final word on the fate of love.

We, in the LGBTQ community, will be the arbiters of our own legal equality and the authors of our own marital destiny, our equal right to marry the people that we love in the country that we love with the pride that we love.

Today, that right makes America a more perfect union.

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY).

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the Respect for Marriage Act.

In all my decades of public service, I have never wavered in my support for the LGBTQ+ community. In 1990, I introduced the first legislation in New York State history to grant legal recognition to same-sex couples.

When the Defense of Marriage Act was introduced in 1996, I was one of 67 House Members to vote against it. I knew then what I know now: DOMA was a bigoted, discriminatory solution to a problem that never existed.

It never made sense that I, or anyone in this body or in this country, could get in a cab and marry the cabdriver that same day or some stranger on the street, but a bold, brave New Yorker and a friend of mine named Edie Windsor could not have her marriage recognized.

She sued. She won in court. Today, this law will codify her court case. I dedicate my remarks to her and thank her for her lifelong commitment to LGBTQ rights and equality.

Madam Speaker, I urge my friends on both sides of the aisle to support this bill.

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.



Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ).

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the Respect for Marriage Act because every American deserves to have their union recognized and respected in law.

Since the Obergefell and Loving decisions, millions of families rely on the constitutional guarantee that marriage equality affords. Yet, we just saw what happens when half our population relies on this High Court to protect our sacred rights.

Recent far-right Court nominees broke their pledges to respect the precedent of Roe, and look at the legal chaos, unequal treatment, and financial and physical ruin they have unleashed.

We can no more rely on their word than we can their apologists who say these legal extremists will uphold marriage equality.

This bill ensures that by guaranteeing that same-sex and interracial couples have a legal right to build a life with someone who shares their love.

I am honored to stand with the LGBTQ+ community to make this a more just, equal, and perfect union. Without these rights and this legislation, America can never truly aspire to that.

Madam Speaker, I remind all of my colleagues that history is watching, and I urge them to vote “yea” on the Senate amendment.

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. PETERS).

Mr. PETERS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to support the Respect for Marriage Act. Today, we celebrate equality, fairness, and love.

Since the Supreme Court’s ruling in Obergefell, all loving couples have had a right to marry across our country. However, if the Supreme Court won’t protect Americans, especially in light of the repeal of Roe, we in Congress must do everything in our power to defend those freedoms.

The Respect for Marriage Act ensures Federal marriage equality by guaranteeing the Federal rights, benefits, and obligations of marriages. Today’s legislation provides certainty for those couples, and all future couples, that the Federal Government will continue to recognize their marriages, no matter where they live or who they are married to.

I am proud to support this historic bill alongside members of both parties to protect the rights of San Diegans and Americans across the country.

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. NORCROSS).

Mr. NORCROSS. Madam Speaker, I rise today on behalf of marriage equality.

The bills we write and pass regularly affect millions of lives. Rarely is the legislation we vote on so personal as the bill we are voting on today, the Respect for Marriage Act.

My daughter and her wife are two of the estimated 26 million Americans whose freedom to marry will be protected by this bill. Their son, my 1-year-old grandson, Reza, can now grow up without risk to his family. Love is a precious thing.

Madam Speaker, I know my daughters will now know our Nation respects their marriage. You cannot legislate love, but you can give love the protection of our laws. I thank the gentleman and I urge my colleagues to vote for this.

□1000

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. TLAIB).

Ms. TLAIB. Madam Speaker, I rise today in solidarity with our LGBTQ+ community who have fought for equal dignity under the law for decades.

For far too long our LGBTQ+ neighbors have been discriminated against simply for being who they are and loving who they love. Today, if that case is overturned, same-sex couples would not be allowed to marry in the State of Michigan.

Every single American, no matter their faith, race, gender identity, or sexual orientation has the right to marry the person they love.

I am proud to be here today in the people’s House as Congress takes this historic vote to send this legislation to President Biden’s desk.

Today, we take one more step toward equality and justice for all. May we continue to build upon this progress by ensuring that all LGBTQ+ neighbors have what they need to thrive and be protected under law.

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. JEFFRIES), a member of the committee, and the soon-to-be Democratic leader.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Madam Speaker, I thank the chair for yielding and for his leadership.

The founding document of this country, the Declaration of Independence, reads:

We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equally, entitled to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Those words were eloquent in their articulation and complete in their application.

As the great Barbara Jordan once pointed out, initially they didn’t apply to enslaved Africans or women, Native Americans, poor people of every race,

and certainly it didn’t apply to the LGBTQ+ community. But through a process of constitutional amendment ratification, court decision, and legislation, those words have increasingly been brought to life as we journey toward a more perfect union.

That is the work that is being done today with the Respect for Marriage Act, particularly because of a radical, right-wing, reckless, and regressive Supreme Court majority that threatens freedom and marriage equality.

Madam Speaker, that is why I urge my colleagues to support the Respect for Marriage Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. CRAIG). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 15 seconds to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Madam Speaker, I support the Respect for Marriage Act, I respect freedom, liberty, and justice for all.

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. JAYAPAL), a member of the committee.

Ms. JAYAPAL. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong and joyful support of the Respect for Marriage Act.

As the mother of an incredible trans daughter, I am here to fight for her rights and those of all LGBTQ+ people, who for too long have been denied the dignity and the respect that they deserve. And as someone who is myself in an interracial marriage, it is far past time that we codify those rights.

An extremist Supreme Court and hateful State legislators want to roll back the hard-won progress that we have made. But we are here to say in a bipartisan way, we will not tolerate this, we will codify these rights once and for all.

This is the beginning. I also call on the Senate to pass the Equality Act to ensure that LGBTQ+ people can enjoy the same rights as everyone else in the country.

But today, Madam Speaker, let’s get this bill done. Vote “yes” on codifying the right to marry the one you love. Vote “yes” on the Respect for Marriage Act.

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the majority leader of the House of Representatives.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I am going to miss this 1 minute, let me tell you that.

This bill was passed with a very bipartisan vote in this House this past July. I rise in strong support of the Respect for Marriage Act, which this bill has been slightly amended and sent to us.

Like many Americans across the country, I was sickened and deeply sorry by the violent attack on an

LGBTQ+ nightclub in Colorado Springs just a few weeks ago. It was a manifestation of hate, a manifestation of prejudice, a manifestation of bigotry, a manifestation of thinking one is better than the other, that somehow we are not all equal in the eyes of our Constitution and in the eyes of God.

It was a somber reminder of how safe spaces still are not safe for so many. One of the Club Q survivors, a young man named Anthony, said that as he lay wounded on the floor his first thought—not surprisingly, which he believed may be his last thought—was of his husband of 14 years, Jeremy.

What the Justices said some years ago and what we have said in our legislation is that who you love is your choice. One of the first votes I cast in the Maryland State Senate in 1967 was the repeal of the miscegenation statute. The Supreme Court, that same year, had ruled that unconstitutional. That because a Black male wanted to marry a White woman or a White woman wanted to marry a Black male or an Asian or of some other ethnicity or race, that somehow we would interpose our own judgment denying that all people are created equal, endowed by their creator—not by us, not by the Constitution—by their creator with certain unalienable rights, among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Certainly, the pursuit of happiness means that you can love whom you chose.

The love that Anthony felt for his husband in that moment reflected a basic emotional instinct that makes us all human.

Madam Speaker, I rise today for the millions of people like Anthony and Jeremy who deserve to continue living proudly and happily and safely in same-sex and interracial marriages.

In doing so, I stand for all Americans who cherish the liberty, equality, and justice promised to them under our Constitution.

Last summer, the Supreme Court, largely the Republican faction of the Supreme Court—they will resent that phrase, I am sure—violated that sacred promise with their radical ruling in *Dobbs v. Jackson*, breaking nearly 50 years of precedent, contrary to what some of those Justices said to the United States Senate their premise would be. They deprived women of their constitutional right to reproductive healthcare, to control their own bodies, the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

In the process, they also opened the door for future challenges to *Obergefell v. Hodges*, *United States v. Windsor*, and *Loving v. Virginia*, which dealt with you couldn't marry a person of another color.

The *Obergefell* and *Windsor* precedents protecting same-sex marriage have stood for 7 and 9 years respectively, not the half a century that the others had, but the same proposition. It is not your business. I am shocked that conservatives who have a liber-

tarian bent believe that somehow we ought to get involved in this.

Madam Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support this.

I remember the most conservative member of the State Senate, in which I served for 12 years, got up in talking about a woman's right to choose, and said: It is not my business. It is not government's business. It is not the legislators' business. It is my business. It is her business.

The Loving precedent protecting interracial marriage has stood for 55 years. Justice Thomas perhaps would opine that it is not a right that is found in the Constitution.

After the Supreme Court disregarded decades of precedent to overturn *Roe v. Wade*, we have no reason to expect it won't do the same to marriage equality. We believe that all men are created equal and all women, and men and women together.

Americans have grown accustomed to knowing that they have a constitutional right to equal marriage. Those living in same-sex and interracial marriages should not have to live with the fear that their government could rescind legal recognition of their families at any moment. That is not America. That is not content of character, as Martin Luther King urged us to pursue—character.

They must be able to live confidently, knowing that their marriages will be recognized wherever they go in America—no matter the city, county, or State.

Our Democratic House majority knows that no State ought to be able to deny full faith and credit to legal marriage between consenting American adults, and a lot of Republicans agree with us.

This is not a partisan issue. I hope it is not a partisan issue in this vote. It certainly was not a partisan issue when we passed it to the Senate. It was not a partisan vote in the United States Senate.

We know the best way to protect that most basic right to marriage equality is to enshrine it in Federal statute. That is why we took swift action last summer to pass the Respect for Marriage Act through the House and why I am proud to bring it to the floor again today.

Madam Speaker, I thank Chairman NADLER and the staff of the committee. I thank Representative CICILLINE and all the co-chairs of the LGBTQ+ Equality Caucus. This is not a caucus issue; this is a country issue. This is a constitutional issue. This is a fairness issue. This is justice for all.

I thank Chairman RUIZ and the Democratic Caucus chairman, Mr. JEFFRIES, who has been very involved in this bill, and Chairwoman BEATTY, they all have worked hard on this bill.

Similarly, I appreciate the House Republicans who joined us in supporting this bill—a significant number of House Republicans. I would hope that all Republicans would do it on the the-

ory that this is not our business, that people are free to make their own decisions, not the government making these decisions.

I also thank the 62 Senators, including 12 Republicans that came together to advance this critical legislation.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, all 435 of us, to stand up and say this is a free country. It is a country that believes in equality for all. This is a country that the representatives of our Constitution, our Declaration, and of our laws would stand up united in saying: You are free to love who you choose. It is not our choice.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, what happened in Colorado, as the gentleman referenced, was wrong as wrong could be. We all understand that.

But you know what else is wrong?

The 100 churches and crisis pregnancy centers that were attacked in the aftermath of the *Dobbs* decision—actually, when the leak happened. Dozens and dozens of those attacks happened between the leak of the opinion and the opinion itself, all designed to intimidate the Supreme Court.

And what did this body do while that was happening and Supreme Court Justices' homes were being—protests, harassed, all kinds of things said about their family, an assassination attempt on one of those justices, Justice Kavanaugh—what did this body do?

They waited a month to pass legislation to give our highest court members the protection they needed. This body did that.

There is no place for violence. But let's be clear: Let's condemn all of it. Let's do what we can to protect against it, and let's not stay on this concerted effort to intimidate the Court.

By the way, Madam Speaker, we have yet to have a hearing on the leak of the *Dobbs* decision, but in 1 hour and 15 minutes we are going to have a hearing on the fake leak that was brought up about Justice Alito in the Hobby Lobby case.

Why can't we get to the bottom of what happened earlier this year with the *Dobbs* decision that resulted in all that violence—over 100 churches and crisis pregnancy centers attacked?

I would like to have a hearing on that. I hope at some point the chairman will—we will look into doing that next year when we convene the new Congress.

Mr. HOYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

□ 1015

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I just want to make clear, the gentleman indicated that we did nothing. The Justices of the Supreme Court had full protection. The issue was the families and the families of Members, but it ought to be on the public record that

the Supreme Court Members were protected.

Mr. JORDAN. Reclaiming my time, the fact is, the Senate passed the bill and you guys waited a month before we passed it on the House floor, and you know that is accurate.

Mr. HOYER. If the gentleman will continue to yield, you represented that the Justices were unprotected. That is not accurate, sir.

Mr. JORDAN. Justices' families; I will correct that. But you guys waited a month to do that when they were being threatened. That is my point.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I have been listening to this debate on the Republican side and it is self-contradictory. On the one hand, don't worry about it. Obergefell is not threatened. It is the law of the land. The Supreme Court has decided it. There is no threat. You guys are exaggerating the threat to Obergefell.

On the other hand, this bill is catastrophic. My God, it will change things.

Well, how will it change things if Obergefell is going to keep going? This bill will threaten the institution of marriage somehow.

Really? I don't think it will threaten the institution of marriage, especially since it is irrelevant since Obergefell is going to continue. You can't argue out of both sides of your mouth.

I would also point out, as I will in my closing statement, that contrary to the fears expressed about religious liberty, almost every church group in the United States has endorsed this bill. I will read a list in my closing statement.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the distinguished Speaker of the House.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support for the Respect for Marriage Act, an historic step forward in Democrats' fight to defend the dignity and equality of every American.

Let us salute those who have legislated and advocated relentlessly to make this bill the law of the land. I thank the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, JERRY NADLER, Equality Caucus Chair DAVID CICILLINE, and all of the members of the Equality Caucus, and the grassroots activists out there, without whose mobilization so many pieces of legislation to expand freedom in our country would not be possible.

I say that because when I came to this floor 35 years ago, my first speech on the floor, after I was sworn in, was to talk about—say that I came here to fight HIV and AIDS. What I learned after that is we had to fight against discrimination against people with HIV and AIDS.

Two people who were so significant in that are Phyllis and Del, Del Martin

and Phyllis Lyon, champions in our country. Well, I will talk about them in a moment.

First, I want to salute the Senate for its strong bipartisan legislation, the leadership of Majority Leader CHUCK SCHUMER and Senator TAMMY BALDWIN, and the bipartisan, strong support that this House gave the legislation to send it over to the Senate.

Marriage equality has been law across our country since 2015 and, proudly, even longer in the State of California. Indeed, my thoughts today are with Phyllis Lyon and Del Martin, two dear friends and iconic trailblazers. I have brought their picture to the floor time and time again to talk about freedom and dignity and respect so many times.

Nearly two decades ago, their enduring love made history as they joyfully, joyfully said their vows in San Francisco City Hall, the first. In the years since, the same euphoria has blessed couples and bonded families in every corner of America.

Yet, since the Supreme Court's monstrous decision overturning *Roe v. Wade*, rightwing forces have set their sights on this basic personal freedom.

In his concurrent opinion, Clarence Thomas explicitly called on the Court to reconsider its ruling in Obergefell. While his legal reasoning is twisted and unsound, we must take Justice Thomas at his word and the hateful movement behind him at their word.

We must act now, on a bipartisan, bicameral basis, to combat bigoted extremism and uphold the inviolability of same-sex and interracial marriages.

Once signed into law, the Respect for Marriage Act will help prevent rightwing extremists from: Upending the lives of loving couples, traumatizing kids across the country, and turning back the clock on hard-won progress.

This legislation takes several steps to uphold marriage equality under Federal law.

First, it tears the bigoted, unconstitutional Defense of Marriage Act off the books for good. When that bill was passed, our colleagues understood that it was not constitutional. Why else would they have tried to strip the judicial review of the Defense of Marriage Act if they thought it could take the test of judicial review?

Today's vote will codify a legal reality already handed down by the Supreme Court and ensure DOMA can never again be used to justify hateful discrimination.

Second, the Respect for Marriage Act will enshrine married couples' right to equal protection under Federal law, from tax filings to Social Security, to bereavement and veterans' benefits.

Third, this legislation will require that every State recognize all valid out-of-state marriages, regardless of any heinous restrictions imposed by particular State law.

This legislation is the latest step in House Democrats' fight to win full equality for LGBTQ Americans and

forge a more perfect union that our children and their children, all of our children deserve.

Fighting alongside tireless advocates, we transformed the fight against HIV/AIDS, here at home and around the world; and I thank President Bush for his leadership in that regard as well, all of our Presidents—well, up until a certain point.

We tossed Don't Ask, Don't Tell into the dustbin of history. We enacted fully inclusive Federal hate crimes legislation, protecting Americans from the scourge of bigoted violence, with the Matthew Shepard Act; our friend, Barney Frank, our former colleague, was so instrumental in passing that legislation.

Today, we will include marriage equality into Federal law now and for generations to come.

I am just going to speak personally for a moment because, as I mentioned earlier, my first words on the floor of this House were about fighting against HIV and AIDS and discrimination that goes with that.

My final bill as Speaker the first time, one of the final bills that I signed was the repeal of Don't Ask, Don't Tell. Now, one of the final bills that I will sign in the enrollment will be this beautiful legislation, the Respect for Marriage Act that we are passing today.

Today, we stand up for the values the vast majority of Americans hold dear, a belief in the dignity, beauty, and divinity, divinity, spark of divinity in every person, an abiding respect for love so powerful that it binds two people together.

San Francisco's—when we talk about freedom, I think of Harvey Milk. He once told his supporters: "I have tasted freedom. I will not give up that which I have tasted."

Thus, today, this Chamber proudly stands with the forces of freedom, not going back, and justice.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a resounding bipartisan "aye" vote in favor of the Respect for Marriage Act in loving memory of Del Martin and Phyllis Lyon, my dear friends, and iconic pioneers, and I urge a strong bipartisan vote.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York). The Chair will remind all persons in the gallery that they are here as guests of the House and that any manifestation of approval or disapproval of proceedings is in violation of the rules of the House.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I would urge a "no" vote based on arguments we have made on the floor today. I think this is—I just urge a "no" vote. I think this is the wrong way to go.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

The Senate amendment to the Respect for Marriage Act represents a carefully negotiated compromise that

maintains all of the bill's substantive protections for marriage equality, while affirming that the religions liberty and conscience protections available under current law remain unaffected by the bill.

For these reasons, leading national organizations have endorsed the bill as amended by the Senate, including the ACLU, GLAD, PFLAG, Human Rights Campaign, and Lambda Legal.

In addition, a broad interfaith coalition that includes the Interfaith Alliance, the Episcopal Church, the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, the United Church of Christ, the Presbyterian Church USA Office of Public Witness, the Union for Reform Judaism, the Anti-Defamation League, the Hindu American Foundation, Muslims for Progressive Values, and the Sikh Coalition, all endorse the Senate amendment to this bill.

This is a long-overdue bill, and I urge my colleagues to support it with a big vote.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Madam Speaker, I am in strong opposition of H.R. 8404, the so-called Respect for Marriage Act.

I remain steadfast in my longstanding belief that marriage, as has been the tradition in this nation and around the world, is between one man and one woman.

To my colleagues who may be swayed by the inadequate attempts made in the Senate to increase religious protections in this flawed piece of legislation: The changes simply do not do enough to protect those that could face the harmful effects of this bill.

The overly vague provisions of this bill leave far too much to be interpreted and decided by the courts. We, as Members of Congress, should be compelled to protect the religious freedom of Americans and should not leave this cornerstone of our Constitution to the whim of the courts.

"Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof . . ."

In passing this bill, our government is making a law that prohibits the free exercise of religion. These are not just words. They are fundamental to our country and who we are as a people.

Moving forward, court cases concerning private entities exercising their religious freedom, much like cases heard this week at the Supreme Court, will face new challenges. They will now be litigated under the rubric of a national policy in which the court could interpret someone not recognizing same-sex marriages, or even abstaining from providing website design services for a same sex marriage, as akin to racial discrimination.

This bill goes far beyond the protection of same-sex marriage. Instead, it exposes private entities to government discrimination based solely on their deeply held religious beliefs.

I urge my colleagues to join me in voting no on this legislation before us today.

Ms. BONAMICI. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of The Respect for Marriage Act because everyone should be able to marry who they love. This important law will protect same-sex and interracial marriages.

When I was serving in the Oregon State Legislature in 2007, I helped pass the Oregon

Family Fairness Act to give same-sex couples many of the rights afforded to married couples. In 2014, a federal district court judge found that Oregon's ban on same-sex marriages violated the Oregon Constitution, and in 2015 the United States Supreme Court held in *Obergefell* that all people have the right to marry who they love.

It is imperative that we pass the Respect for Marriage Act because Justice Thomas cast doubt on rights grounded in privacy, including same-sex and interracial marriages, in his concurring opinion in *Dobbs v. Jackson Women's Health Organization*. The Respect for Marriage Act will enshrine this fundamental right into law and so it continues to be protected.

Although it is essential that we pass the Respect for Marriage Act, this legislation is a compromise. The bill as passed includes an overly expansive exemption for faith-based nonprofit organizations. This exemption is disappointing because it will allow legalized discrimination and undermine the fundamental principles of fairness this legislation is intended to uphold.

As Vice Chair of the Congressional LGBTQ+ Equality Caucus, I am proud to continue standing with members of the LGBTQ+ community and their allies as we pass the Respect for Marriage Act. I remain committed to continue fighting against discrimination, including by enacting the overdue Equality Act to close gaps in civil rights protections.

No one should face prejudice and violence because of who they are or who they love. I urge my colleagues to support the Respect for Marriage Act and swiftly send this bill to President Biden's desk.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to underscore the crucial importance of the religious liberty provisions in the Respect for Marriage Act and to ensure the legislative intent behind these provisions is crystal clear.

As you know, the United States Supreme Court's decision in *Obergefell v. Hodges* from 2015 established a constitutional right to same-sex marriage. When *Obergefell* was argued, then-Solicitor General Verrilli was asked whether recognizing a constitutional right to same-sex marriage would lead to churches, religious organizations and other not-for-profits potentially having their tax-exempt status reconsidered, in light of the Supreme Court's decision in *Bob Jones University v. U.S.* Solicitor General Verrilli responded that "it's certainly going to be an issue." In recognizing a constitutional right to same-sex marriage in 2015, the United States Supreme Court did not reconsider the *Bob Jones University* precedent, leaving this "issue" unresolved.

The Senate Amendment to the Respect for Marriage Act that we are voting on today, answers this question, and a number of others, providing strong protections for religious liberty, especially when combined with the Religious Freedom Restoration Act.

It is my understanding that section 2 of the Respect for Marriage Act, in light of the Supreme Court's *Bob Jones v. United States* decision in 1983, would prevent the Internal Revenue Service from successfully arguing that the United States now "national policy" favoring same-sex marriage use this national policy to deny tax-exempt status to religious organizations.

Section 2 of the bill states that a variety of reasonable views on the role of gender in

marriage exist today, based on both decent and honorable religious and philosophical beliefs. The bill states that all views are due proper respect by the Federal Government.

Furthermore, Section 2 of this bill states that the Federal Government recognizes religious liberty as an integral component of our national policy regarding marriage. Section 2 of this bill was explicitly included to ensure that the provisions of the *Bob Jones* case relating to the tax-exempt status of organizations are not applicable to this bill.

*Bob Jones University v. U.S.*, decided in 1983 before Congress enacted the Religious Freedom Restoration Act, upheld the IRS' decision to rescind *Bob Jones University's* tax exemption on the basis of a "firm and unyielding" national policy against racial discrimination. Section 2 affirms that diverse beliefs about the role of gender in marriage are held by reasonable and sincere people based on decent and honorable religious or philosophical premises. This finding preempts an analogy between the Court's analysis in the *Bob Jones University* case about race and beliefs about marriage, and is a statement of policy respecting diverse views about the role of gender in marriage.

I'd like to discuss another provision which is central this bill—section 4, which grants "full faith and credit" under Article IV, Section 1 of the United States Constitution to marriages performed in each of our states, strengthening federalism and making our constitutional structure work.

Section 4 of the bill states that no person "acting under color of State law" may deny full faith and credit to any "public act, record, or judicial proceeding of any other State pertaining to a marriage between 2 individuals, on the basis of the sex, race, ethnicity, or national origin of those individuals." The phrase "acting under color of State law" is also used in our civil rights statutes to refer to the actions of state and local government officers and employees with respect to rights guaranteed by the United States Constitution and Federal law.

It is my understanding that use of this phrase in section 4 of the bill is intended to incorporate the United States Supreme Court's interpretation of this term, including but not limited to the *Rendell-Baker v. Kohn* and *NCAA v. Tarkanian* cases.

I'd like to now turn to section 6 of the bill, which provides that no church or religious non-profit will be forced to solemnize or conduct a marriage ceremony under this bill.

It is my understanding that section 6(b) bars any civil claim or cause of action relating to a nonprofit religious organization's refusal under that section to solemnize or celebrate a marriage and that such a refusal cannot create a civil claim or cause of action.

The text of section 7 also makes no reference to "compelling governmental interests." Section 7 provides that nothing in this bill should be construed to deny or alter the benefit, status or right of an otherwise eligible individual or legal entity in relation to tax-exempt status, tax treatment, contracts, loans, scholarships, licenses and other agreements not arising from a marriage.

It is my understanding that, in conjunction with section 2, which eliminates a successful analogy to the *Bob Jones* case, section 7 would prevent the Internal Revenue Service from using the Respect for Marriage Act to

alter or remove the tax-exempt status of an entity for expressing beliefs in opposition or support of same-sex marriage. This bill is intended to enshrine a national policy of respect for all views surrounding marriage, and to enact some of the strongest religious liberty protections since the Religious Freedom Restoration Act in 1993. This legislation also ensures that religious liberty will have more of a central role in future debates in our courts and in the halls of Congress.

Mrs. MURPHY of Florida. Madam Speaker, I rise today to underscore the crucial importance of the religious liberty provisions in the Respect for Marriage Act and to ensure the legislative intent behind these provisions is crystal clear.

As you know, the United States Supreme Court's decision in *Obergefell v. Hodges* from 2015 established a constitutional right to same-sex marriage. When *Obergefell* was argued, then-Solicitor General Verrilli was asked whether recognizing a constitutional right to same-sex marriage would lead to churches, religious organizations and other not-for-profits potentially having their tax-exempt status reconsidered, in light of the Supreme Court's decision in *Bob Jones University v. U.S. Solicitor General Verrilli* responded that "it's certainly going to be an issue." In recognizing a constitutional right to same-sex marriage in 2015, the United States Supreme Court did not reconsider the *Bob Jones University* precedent, leaving this "issue" unresolved.

The Senate Amendment to the Respect for Marriage Act that we are voting on today, answers this question, and a number of others, providing strong protections for religious liberty, especially when combined with the Religious Freedom Restoration Act.

It is my understanding that section 2 of the Respect for Marriage Act, in light of the Supreme Court's *Bob Jones v. United States* decision in 1983, would prevent the Internal Revenue Service from successfully arguing that the United States now has a "national policy" favoring same-sex marriage, and use this national policy to deny tax-exempt status to religious organizations.

Section 2 of the bill states that a variety of reasonable views on the role of gender in marriage exist today, based on both decent and honorable religious and philosophical beliefs. The bill states that all views are due proper respect by the Federal Government.

Furthermore, Section 2 of this bill states that the Federal Government recognizes religious liberty as an integral component of our national policy regarding marriage. Section 2 of this bill was explicitly included to ensure that the provisions of the *Bob Jones* case relating to the tax-exempt status of organizations are not applicable to this bill.

*Bob Jones University v. U.S.*, decided in 1983 before Congress enacted the Religious Freedom Restoration Act, upheld the IRS' decision to rescind *Bob Jones University's* tax exemption on the basis of a "firm and unyielding" national policy against racial discrimination. Section 2 affirms that diverse beliefs about the role of gender in marriage are held by reasonable and sincere people based on decent and honorable religious or philosophical premises. This finding preempts an analogy between the Court's analysis in the *Bob Jones University* case about race and beliefs about marriage, and is a statement of policy respecting diverse views about the role of gender in marriage.

I'd like to discuss another provision which is central to this bill—section 4, which grants "full faith and credit" under Article IV, Section 1 of the United States Constitution to marriages performed in each of our States, strengthening federalism and making our constitutional structure work.

Section 4 of the bill states that no person "acting under color of State law" may deny full faith and credit to any "public act, record, or judicial proceeding of any other State pertaining to a marriage between 2 individuals, on the basis of the sex, race, ethnicity, or national origin of those individuals." The phrase "acting under color of State law" is also used in our civil rights statutes to refer to the actions of State and local government officers and employees with respect to rights guaranteed by the United States Constitution and Federal law.

It is my understanding that use of this phrase in section 4 of the bill is intended to incorporate the United States Supreme Court's interpretation of this term, including but not limited to the *Rendel/Baker v. Kohn* and *NCAA v. Tarkanian* cases.

I'd like to now turn to section 6 of the bill, which provides that no church or religious non-profit will be forced to solemnize or conduct a marriage ceremony under this bill.

It is my understanding that section 6(b) bars any civil claim or cause of action relating to a nonprofit religious organization's refusal under that section to solemnize or celebrate a marriage and that such a refusal cannot create a civil claim or cause of action.

The text of section 7 also makes no reference to "compelling governmental interests." Section 7 provides that nothing in this bill should be construed to deny or alter the benefit, status or right of an otherwise eligible individual or legal entity in relation to tax-exempt status, tax treatment, contracts, loans, scholarships, licenses and other agreements not arising from a marriage.

It is my understanding that, in conjunction with section 2, which eliminates a successful analogy to the *Bob Jones* case, section 7 would prevent the Internal Revenue Service from using the Respect for Marriage Act to alter or remove the tax-exempt status of an entity for expressing beliefs in opposition or support of same-sex marriage. This bill is intended to enshrine a national policy of respect for all views surrounding marriage, and to enact some of the strongest religious liberty protections since the Religious Freedom Restoration Act in 1993. This legislation also ensures that religious liberty will have more of a central role in future debates in our courts and in the halls of Congress.

The SPEAKER. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 1510, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the motion by the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 258, nays 169, answered "present" 1, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 513]

YEAS—258

Adams	Golden	O'Halleran
Aguilar	Gomez	Obernolte
Allred	Gonzales, Tony	Ocasio-Cortez
Armstrong	Gonzalez (OH)	Omar
Auchincloss	Gonzalez,	Pallone
Axne	Vicente	Panetta
Bacon	Gottheimer	Pappas
Barragan	Green, Al (TX)	Pascarell
Bass	Grijalva	Payne
Beatty	Harder (CA)	Pelosi
Bera	Hayes	Peltola
Beyer	Herrera Beutler	Perlmutter
Bishop (GA)	Higgins (NY)	Peters
Blumenauer	Himes	Phillips
Blunt Rochester	Hinson	Pingree
Bonamici	Horsford	Pocan
Bourdeaux	Houlahan	Porter
Bowman	Hoyer	Pressley
Boyle, Brendan	Huffman	Price (NC)
F.	Issa	Quigley
Brown (MD)	Jackson Lee	Raskin
Brown (OH)	Jacobs (CA)	Rice (NY)
Brownley	Jacobs (NY)	Rice (SC)
Bush	Jayapal	Ross
Bustos	Jeffries	Roybal-Allard
Butterfield	Johnson (GA)	Ruiz
Calvert	Johnson (TX)	Ruppersberger
Cammack	Jones	Rush
Carbajal	Joyce (OH)	Ryan (NY)
Cardenas	Kahele	Ryan (OH)
Carey	Kaptur	Sánchez
Carson	Katko	Sarbanes
Carter (LA)	Keating	Scanlon
Cartwright	Kelly (IL)	Schakowsky
Case	Khanna	Schiff
Casten	Kildee	Schneider
Castor (FL)	Kilmer	Schradner
Castro (TX)	Kim (NJ)	Schrier
Cheney	Kind	Scott (VA)
Cherfilus-	Kirkpatrick	Scott, David
McCormick	Krishnamoorthi	Sewell
Chu	Kuster	Sherman
Ciциlline	Lamb	Sherrill
Clark (MA)	Langevin	Simpson
Clarke (NY)	Larsen (WA)	Sires
Cleaver	Larson (CT)	Slotkin
Clyburn	Lawrence	Smith (WA)
Cohen	Lawson (FL)	Soto
Connolly	Lee (CA)	Spanberger
Cooper	Lee (NV)	Speier
Correa	Leger Fernandez	Stansbury
Costa	Levin (CA)	Stanton
Courtney	Levin (MI)	Stefanik
Craig	Lieu	Steil
Crow	Lofgren	Stevens
Cuellar	Lowenthal	Stewart
Curtis	Luria	Strickland
Davids (KS)	Lynch	Suozi
Davis, Danny K.	Mace	Swalwell
Davis, Rodney	Malinowski	Takano
Dean	Malliotakis	Thompson (CA)
DeFazio	Maloney,	Thompson (MS)
DeGette	Carolyn B.	Titus
DeLauro	Maloney, Sean	Tlaib
DelBene	Manning	Tonko
Demings	Matsui	Torres (CA)
DeSaulnier	McBath	Torres (NY)
Dingell	McCollum	Trahan
Doggett	McGovern	Trone
Doyle, Michael	McNerney	Turner
F.	Meeks	Underwood
Emmer	Meijer	Upton
Escobar	Meng	Valadao
Eshoo	Mfume	Vargas
Espallat	Miller-Meeks	Veasey
Evans	Moore (UT)	Velázquez
Fitzpatrick	Moore (WI)	Wagner
Fletcher	Morelle	Waltz
Foster	Moulton	Wasserman
Frankel, Lois	Mrvan	Schultz
Gallagher	Murphy (FL)	Waters
Galleo	Nadler	Watson Coleman
Garamendi	Napolitano	Welch
Garbarino	Neal	Wexton
Garcia (CA)	Neguse	Wild
Garcia (IL)	Newhouse	Williams (GA)
Garcia (TX)	Newman	Wilson (FL)
Gimenez	Norcross	Yarmuth

NAYS—169

Aderholt	Balderson	Biggs
Allen	Banks	Bilirakis
Amodel	Barr	Bishop (NC)
Arrington	Bentz	Boebert
Babin	Bergman	Bost
Baird	Bice (OK)	Brooks

Buchanan  
Buck  
Bucshon  
Budd  
Burchett  
Burgess  
Carl  
Carter (GA)  
Carter (TX)  
Cawthorn  
Chabot  
Cline  
Cloud  
Clyde  
Cole  
Comer  
Conway  
Crawford  
Crenshaw  
Davidson  
DesJarlais  
Diaz-Balart  
Donalds  
Duncan  
Dunn  
Ellzey  
Estes  
Fallon  
Feenstra  
Ferguson  
Finstad  
Fischbach  
Fitzgerald  
Fleischmann  
Flood  
Flores  
Foxy  
Franklin, C.  
Scott  
Fulcher  
Gaetz  
Gibbs  
Gohmert  
Good (VA)  
Gooden (TX)  
Gosar  
Granger  
Graves (LA)  
Graves (MO)  
Green (TN)  
Greene (GA)

Griffith  
Grothman  
Guest  
Guthrie  
Harris  
Harshbarger  
Hartzler  
Hern  
Herrell  
Hice (GA)  
Higgins (LA)  
Hill  
Hudson  
Huizenga  
Jackson  
Johnson (LA)  
Johnson (OH)  
Johnson (SD)  
Jordan  
Joyce (PA)  
Keller  
Kelly (MS)  
Kelly (PA)  
Kim (CA)  
Kustoff  
LaHood  
LaMalfa  
Lamborn  
Latta  
LaTurner  
Lesko  
Letlow  
Long  
Loudermilk  
Lucas  
Luetkemeyer  
Mann  
Massie  
Mast  
McCarthy  
McCaul  
McClain  
McClintock  
McHenry  
McKinley  
Meuser  
Miller (IL)  
Miller (WV)  
Moolenaar  
Mooney  
Moore (AL)

Mullin  
Murphy (NC)  
Nehls  
Norman  
Palazzo  
Palmer  
Pence  
Perry  
Pfluger  
Posey  
Reschenthaler  
Rodgers (WA)  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rose  
Rosendale  
Rouzer  
Roy  
Rutherford  
Salazar  
Scalise  
Schweikert  
Scott, Austin  
Sempolinski  
Sessions  
Smith (MO)  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smucker  
Spartz  
Stauber  
Steel  
Steube  
Taylor  
Tenney  
Thompson (PA)  
Tiffany  
Timmons  
Van Drew  
Van Duyne  
Walberg  
Weber (TX)  
Webster (FL)  
Wenstrup  
Westerman  
Williams (TX)  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Womack  
Yakym

## ANSWERED “PRESENT”—1

Owens

## NOT VOTING—4

Brady  
Hollingsworth

Kinzinger  
Zeldin

□ 1111

Ms. LEE of California changed her vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion to concur was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The motion to reconsider is laid on the table.

## MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Axne (Pappas)  
Baird (Bucshon)  
Bass (Cicilline)  
Beatty (Neguse)  
Brooks  
(Fleischmann)  
DeFazio  
(Pallone)  
Doyle, Michael  
F. (Pallone)  
Gibbs (Smucker)  
Gohmert (Weber  
(TX))  
Gonzalez (OH)  
(Moore (UT))  
Gosar (Weber  
(TX))  
Hayes (Neguse)  
Herrera Beutler  
(Stewart)  
Huffman (Levin  
(CA))  
Jacobs (NY)  
(Sempolinski)

Johnson (LA)  
(Graves (LA))  
Johnson (OH)  
(Fulcher)  
Johnson (TX)  
(Pallone)  
Kahale (Correa)  
Kildee (Pappas)  
Kirkpatrick  
(Pallone)  
Lawrence  
(Garcia (TX))  
Lawson (FL)  
(Evans)  
Lieu (Beyer)  
Long  
(Fleischmann)  
Meeks (Meng)  
Napolitano  
(Correa)  
Newman (Correa)  
O'Halleran  
(Pappas)

Palazzo  
(Fleischmann)  
Pascrell  
(Pallone)  
Payne (Pallone)  
Peltola (Correa)  
Pressley  
(Neguse)  
Ruppersberger  
(Sarbanes)  
Rush (Beyer)  
Simpson  
(Fulcher)  
Sires (Pallone)  
Suoizzi (Cicilline)  
Swalwell  
(Correa)  
Titus (Pallone)  
Welch (Pallone)  
Wexton (Beyer)  
Williams (GA)  
(McBath)

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. DEGETTE). The Chair will remind all persons in the gallery that they are here as guests of the House and that any manifestation of approval or disapproval of proceedings is in violation of the rules of the House.

□ 1115

Mr. ROY. Madam Speaker, I object.  
The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

## MOTION TO RECONSIDER VOTE ON CONCURRING IN THE SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.R. 8404, RESPECT FOR MARRIAGE ACT

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, I have a motion at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. PERLMUTTER of Colorado moved to reconsider the vote on concurring in the Senate amendment to H.R. 8404.

## MOTION TO TABLE

Mr. CICILLINE. Madam Speaker, I have a motion at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Cicilline of Rhode Island moves to lay the motion to reconsider on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to table.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. ROY. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 224, nays 164, not voting 44, as follows:

[Roll No. 514]

## YEAS—224

Adams  
Aguilar  
Allred  
Armstrong  
Auchincloss  
Axne  
Bacon  
Barragán  
Bass  
Beatty  
Bera  
Beyer  
Bishop (GA)  
Blumenauer  
Blunt Rochester  
Bonamici  
Bourdeaux  
Bowman  
Boyle, Brendan  
F.  
Brown (MD)  
Brown (OH)  
Brownley  
Bush  
Bustos  
Butterfield  
Calvert  
Cammack  
Cárbaal  
Cárdenas  
Carey  
Carson  
Carter (LA)  
Case  
Casten  
Castor (FL)

Castro (TX)  
Cheney  
Cherfilus-  
McCormick  
Chu  
Cicilline  
Clark (MA)  
Clarke (NY)  
Cleaver  
Clyburn  
Connolly  
Correa  
Costa  
Courtney  
Craig  
Cuellar  
Curtis  
Davids (KS)  
Davis, Danny K.  
Dean  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
DeLauro  
DelBene  
Demings  
DeSaunier  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Doyle, Michael  
F.  
Escobar  
Eshoo  
Fitzpatrick  
Fletcher  
Frankel, Lois  
Gallagher

Galleo  
Garbarino  
Garcia (IL)  
Garcia (TX)  
Gimenez  
Gomez  
Gonzalez (OH)  
Gottheimer  
Green, Al (TX)  
Grijalva  
Hayes  
Herrera Beutler  
Higgins (NY)  
Himes  
Hinson  
Houlahan  
Hoyer  
Huffman  
Jackson Lee  
Jacobs (CA)  
Jacobs (NY)  
Jayapal  
Jeffries  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson (TX)  
Jones  
Joyce (OH)  
Kahale  
Kaptur  
Keating  
Kelly (IL)  
Kildee  
Kilmer  
Kim (NJ)  
Kind  
Kirkpatrick

Krishnamoorthi  
Kuster  
Lamb  
Langevin  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Lawrence  
Lee (CA)  
Lee (NV)  
Leger Fernandez  
Levin (CA)  
Levin (MI)  
Lieu  
Lofgren  
Lowenthal  
Luria  
Lynch  
Mace  
Malinowski  
Malliotakis  
Maloney,  
Carolyn B.  
Maloney, Sean  
Manning  
Matsui  
McBath  
McCollum  
McGovern  
McNerney  
Meeks  
Meijer  
Meng  
Mfume  
Miller-Meeks  
Moore (UT)  
Moulton  
Mrvan  
Murphy (FL)  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neal

Neguse  
Newhouse  
Newman  
Norcross  
O'Halleran  
Ocasio-Cortez  
Omar  
Pallone  
Panetta  
Pappas  
Pascrell  
Payne  
Pelosi  
Peltola  
Perlmutter  
Peters  
Phillips  
Pingree  
Pocan  
Porter  
Pressley  
Price (NC)  
Quigley  
Raskin  
Rice (NY)  
Ross  
Roybal-Allard  
Ruiz  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Ryan (NY)  
Ryan (OH)  
Sánchez  
Sarbanes  
Scanlon  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schneider  
Schrier  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, David

Sewell  
Sherman  
Sherrill  
Simpson  
Sires  
Slotkin  
Smith (WA)  
Soto  
Spanberger  
Speier  
Stanton  
Stevens  
Stewart  
Strickland  
Suoizzi  
Swalwell  
Takano  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Titus  
Tonko  
Torres (NY)  
Trahan  
Turner  
Underwood  
Upton  
Valadao  
Vargas  
Veasey  
Velázquez  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters  
Watson Coleman  
Welch  
Wexton  
Wild  
Williams (GA)  
Yarmuth

## NAYS—164

Aderholt  
Amodei  
Arrington  
Babin  
Baird  
Balderson  
Banks  
Barr  
Bentz  
Bergman  
Bice (OK)  
Biggs  
Bilirakis  
Bishop (NC)  
Boebert  
Bost  
Brady  
Brooks  
Buck  
Bucshon  
Budd  
Burchett  
Burgess  
Carl  
Carter (TX)  
Chabot  
Cline  
Cloud  
Clyde  
Cole  
Comer  
Crawford  
Crenshaw  
Davidson  
Davis, Rodney  
DesJarlais  
Diaz-Balart  
Donalds  
Duncan  
Dunn  
Ellzey  
Emmer  
Estes  
Fallon  
Feenstra  
Ferguson  
Finstad  
Fischbach  
Fitzgerald  
Fleischmann  
Flood  
Flores  
Foxy  
Franklin, C.  
Scott

Fulcher  
Gaetz  
Garcia (CA)  
Gibbs  
Good (VA)  
Gooden (TX)  
Granger  
Graves (LA)  
Graves (MO)  
Green (TN)  
Greene (GA)  
Griffith  
Guest  
Guthrie  
Harris  
Harshbarger  
Hartzler  
Hern  
Herrell  
Hice (GA)  
Higgins (LA)  
Hill  
Hudson  
Huizenga  
Issa  
Jackson  
Johnson (LA)  
Johnson (OH)  
Johnson (SD)  
Jordan  
Katko  
Keller  
Kelly (MS)  
Kelly (PA)  
Kim (CA)  
Kustoff  
LaHood  
LaMalfa  
Lamborn  
Latta  
LaTurner  
Lesko  
Letlow  
Long  
Loudermilk  
Luetkemeyer  
Mann  
Massie  
Mast  
McCarthy  
McClain  
McClintock  
McKinley  
Meuser  
Miller (WV)

Moolenaar  
Mooney  
Moore (AL)  
Mullin  
Murphy (NC)  
Nehls  
Norman  
Oberholte  
Owens  
Palazzo  
Palmer  
Pence  
Perry  
Pfluger  
Posey  
Reschenthaler  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rose  
Rosendale  
Rouzer  
Roy  
Rutherford  
Scalise  
Schweikert  
Scott, Austin  
Sempolinski  
Sessions  
Smith (MO)  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smucker  
Stauber  
Steel  
Stefanik  
Steil  
Taylor  
Tenney  
Thompson (PA)  
Tiffany  
Timmons  
Van Drew  
Van Duyne  
Wagner  
Walberg  
Weber (TX)  
Webster (FL)  
Wenstrup  
Westerman  
Williams (TX)  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Womack  
Yakym



## NOT VOTING—44

Allen	Gonzales, Tony	Miller (IL)
Buchanan	Gonzalez,	Moore (WI)
Carter (GA)	Vicente	Morelle
Cartwright	Gosar	Rice (SC)
Cawthorn	Grothman	Rodgers (WA)
Cohen	Harder (CA)	Salazar
Conway	Hollingsworth	Schrader
Cooper	Horsford	Spartz
Crow	Joyce (PA)	Stansbury
Espallat	Khanna	Steube
Evans	Kinzing	Tlaib
Foster	Lawson (FL)	Torres (CA)
Garamendi	Lucas	Trone
Gohmert	McCaul	Wilson (FL)
Golden	McHenry	Zeldin

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1139

Messrs. POSEY, FULCHER, and WESTERMAN changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. GALLAGHER changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. GROTHMAN. Madam Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rollcall No. 514.

## MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Axne (Pappas)	Johnson (OH)	Pascarell
Baird (Bucshon)	(Fulcher)	(Pallone)
Bass (Cicilline)	Johnson (TX)	Payne (Pallone)
Beatty (Neguse)	(Pallone)	Peltola (Correa)
Brooks	Kahele (Correa)	Pressley
(Fleischmann)	Kildee (Pappas)	(Neguse)
Doyle, Michael	Kirkpatrick	Ruppersberger
F. (Pallone)	(Pallone)	(Sarbanes)
Gibbs (Smucker)	Lawrence	Rush (Beyer)
Gohmert (Weber	(Garcia (TX))	Simpson
(TX))	Lieu (Beyer)	(Fulcher)
Gonzalez (OH)	Long	Sires (Pallone)
(Moore (UT))	(Fleischmann)	Suozi (Cicilline)
Hayes (Neguse)	Meeks (Meng)	Swalwell
Herrera Beutler	Napolitano	(Correa)
(Stewart)	(Correa)	Titus (Pallone)
Huffman (Levin	Nehls (Mace)	Welch (Pallone)
(CA))	Newman (Correa)	Wexton (Beyer)
Jacobs (NY)	O'Halleran	Williams (GA)
(Sempolinski)	(Pappas)	(McBath)
Johnson (LA)	Palazzo	(Fleischmann)
(Graves (LA))	(Fleischmann)	

## MOTION TO ADJOURN

Mr. ROY. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to adjourn offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROY).

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. ROY. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 129, nays 227, not voting 75, as follows:

[Roll No. 515]

## YEAS—129

Aderholt	Balderson	Bost
Allen	Bentz	Brooks
Amodei	Biggs	Burchett
Armstrong	Bilirakis	Cammack
Arrington	Bishop (NC)	Carey
Babin	Boebert	Carter (TX)

Cawthorn	Hice (GA)	Palazzo
Cline	Higgins (LA)	Palmer
Cloud	Hinson	Pence
Comer	Hudson	Perry
Conway	Huizenga	Posey
Curtis	Issa	Rodgers (WA)
Davidson	Jackson	Rosendale
DesJarlais	Jacobs (NY)	Rouzer
Duncan	Johnson (LA)	Roy
Ellzey	Jordan	Salazar
Emmer	Joyce (PA)	Schweikert
Estes	Keller	Sempolinski
Feenstra	Kelly (MS)	Sessions
Finstad	Kim (CA)	Sherrill
Fischbach	Kustoff	Smith (MO)
Fitzgerald	LaHood	Smith (NE)
Fleischmann	LaMalfa	Smith (NJ)
Foxx	Lamborn	Smucker
Franklin, C.	Latta	Spartz
Scott	LaTurner	Stauber
Fulcher	Lesko	Stefanik
Gaetz	Letlow	Steil
Garcia (CA)	Long	Stewart
Gibbs	Loudermilk	Taylor
Gohmert	Mann	Tenney
Good (VA)	Massie	Tiffany
Gosar	McCarthy	Timmons
Granger	McClain	Valadao
Graves (LA)	McClintock	Van Drew
Graves (MO)	McKinley	Van Duyn
Green (TN)	Miller (IL)	Walberg
Greene (GA)	Miller (WV)	Weber (TX)
Grothman	Moolenaar	Webster (FL)
Guest	Mooney	Westerman
Harris	Moore (AL)	Williams (TX)
Harshbarger	Mullin	Yakym
Hern	Nehls	
Herrell	Norman	

## NAYS—227

Aguilar	Doyle, Michael	Leger Fernandez
Allred	F.	Levin (CA)
Auchincloss	Eshoo	Levin (MI)
Barragan	Espallat	Lofgren
Beatty	Evans	Lowenthal
Bera	Fitzpatrick	Lucas
Bergman	Fletcher	Luria
Bice (OK)	Flood	Mace
Bishop (GA)	Flores	Malinowski
Blumenauer	Foster	Malliotakis
Blunt Rochester	Frankel, Lois	Maloney,
Bonamici	Gallagher	Carolyn B.
Bourdeaux	Gallo	Manning
Bowman	Garamendi	Matsui
Boyle, Brendan	Garbarino	McBath
F.	Garcia (IL)	McCollum
Brady	Garcia (TX)	McGovern
Brown (MD)	Gimenez	McHenry
Brown (OH)	Golden	McNerney
Brownley	Gomez	Meeks
Bush	Gonzales, Tony	Meijer
Butterfield	Gottheimer	Meng
Calvert	Green, Al (TX)	Mfume
Carbajal	Guthrie	Miller-Meeks
Cárdenas	Harder (CA)	Moore (UT)
Carl	Hartzler	Moore (WI)
Carson	Hayes	Morelle
Carter (LA)	Herrera Beutler	Moulton
Cartwright	Hill	Mrvan
Case	Himes	Murphy (FL)
Casten	Horsford	Napolitano
Castor (FL)	Houlahan	Neal
Castro (TX)	Huffman	Neguse
Chu	Jackson Lee	Newman
Clark (MA)	Jacobs (CA)	Norcross
Clarke (NY)	Jayapal	Ocasio-Cortez
Cleaver	Jeffries	Pallone
Clyburn	Johnson (GA)	Panetta
Clyde	Johnson (OH)	Pascarell
Cole	Johnson (SD)	Payne
Connolly	Johnson (TX)	Peltola
Cooper	Joyce (OH)	Perlmutter
Correa	Kahele	Peters
Costa	Kaptur	Pfuger
Courtney	Katko	Phillips
Crawford	Keating	Pingree
Crenshaw	Kelly (IL)	Pocan
Crow	Khanna	Porter
Cuellar	Kilmer	Pressley
Davis, Danny K.	Kind	Price (NC)
Dean	Kirkpatrick	Quigley
DeFazio	Kuster	Raskin
DeGette	Langevin	Reschenthaler
DeLauro	Larsen (WA)	Rice (NY)
DelBene	Larson (CT)	Rogers (AL)
Demings	Lawrence	Rogers (KY)
DeSaulnier	Lawson (FL)	Ross
Diaz-Balart	Lee (CA)	Roybal-Allard
Doggett	Lee (NV)	Ruiz

Ruppersberger	Smith (WA)	Underwood
Rutherford	Soto	Upton
Ryan (NY)	Spanberger	Vargas
Ryan (OH)	Speier	Veasey
Sánchez	Stansbury	Velázquez
Sarbanes	Stanton	Wagner
Scanlon	Stevens	Waltz
Schakowsky	Strickland	Wasserman
Schiff	Swalwell	Schultz
Schrader	Thompson (CA)	Watson Coleman
Schrier	Thompson (MS)	Welch
Scott (VA)	Titus	Wild
Scott, Austin	Tlaib	Williams (GA)
Scott, David	Tonko	Wilson (FL)
Sewell	Torres (CA)	Wilson (SC)
Simpson	Trahan	Wittman
Sires	Trone	Womack
Slotkin	Turner	Yarmuth

## NOT VOTING—75

Adams	Dunn	Meuser
Axne	Escobar	Murphy (NC)
Bacon	Fallon	Nadler
Baird	Ferguson	Newhouse
Banks	Gonzalez (OH)	O'Halleran
Barr	Gonzalez,	Oberholte
Bass	Vicente	Omar
Beyer	Gooden (TX)	Owens
Buchanan	Griffith	Pappas
Buck	Grijalva	Rice (SC)
Bucshon	Higgins (NY)	Rose
Boony	Hollingsworth	Rush
Burgess	Hoyer	Scalise
Bustos	Jones	Schneider
Carter (GA)	Kelly (PA)	Sherman
Chabot	Kildee	Steel
Cheney	Kim (NJ)	Steube
Cherfilus-	Kinzing	Suozi
McCormick	Krishnamoorthi	Takano
Cicilline	Lamb	Thompson (PA)
Cohen	Lieu	Torres (NY)
Craig	Luetkemeyer	Waters
Davids (KS)	Lynch	Wenstrup
Davis, Rodney	Maloney, Sean	Wexton
Dingell	Mast	Zeldin
Donalds	McCaul	

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1159

Mses. CLARK of Massachusetts and NEWMAN, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Messrs. SWALWELL and BERGMAN changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. GOOD of Virginia changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion to adjourn was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. PAPPAS. Madam Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rollcall No. 515.

Ms. SHERRILL. Madam Speaker, during rollcall Vote Number 515 on Mr. ROY's motion to adjourn, I mistakenly recorded my vote as “yea” when I should have voted “nay.”

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE  
RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Beatty (Neguse)	Johnson (LA)	Palazzo
Brooks	(Graves (LA))	(Fleischmann)
(Fleischmann)	Johnson (OH)	Pascarell
Doyle, Michael	(Fulcher)	(Pallone)
F. (Pallone)	Johnson (TX)	Payne (Pallone)
Gibbs (Smucker)	(Pallone)	Peltola (Correa)
Gohmert (Weber	Kahele (Correa)	Pressley
(TX))	Kirkpatrick	(Neguse)
Gonzales, Tony	(Pallone)	Ruppersberger
(Gimenez)	Lawrence	(Sarbanes)
Gosar (Weber	(Garcia (TX))	Simpson
(TX))	Lawson (FL)	(Fulcher)
Hayes (Neguse)	(Evans)	Sires (Pallone)
Herrera Beutler	Long	Swalwell
(Stewart)	(Fleischmann)	(Correa)
Huffman (Levin	Meeks (Meng)	Titus (Pallone)
(CA))	Napolitano	Welch (Pallone)
Jacobs (NY)	(Correa)	Williams (GA)
(Sempolinski)	Nehls (Mace)	(McBath)
	Newman (Correa)	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER  
PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The House will resume proceedings on postponed questions at a later time.

PERMISSION TO INSERT EXPLANATORY  
MATERIAL ON H.RES. 1512,  
JAMES M. INHOFE NATIONAL DEFENSE  
AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR  
FISCAL YEAR 2023

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the chair of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence and I may each insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD not later than December 12, 2022, such material as we may deem explanatory of the Senate amendment and the motion to concur with the amendment on H.R. 7776.

(The contents of this submission will be published in Book III of this RECORD.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

JAMES M. INHOFE NATIONAL DEFENSE  
AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR  
FISCAL YEAR 2023

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 1512) providing for the concurrence by the House in the Senate amendment to H.R. 7776, with an amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

(Text of H. Res. 1512, see Book II of this RECORD.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH) and the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ROGERS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

## GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that

all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H. Res. 1512.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I rise to urge Members to support this piece of legislation. I thank everyone who worked on this process. All told, from the beginning of it, to now, over 2,000 Member requests were considered in some form or another, either in committee, on the House, or as we worked with the Senate.

With that open, collaborative, and bipartisan process, we have produced, I think, an excellent product. First, and foremost, we support the men and women who serve in the United States military in this bill. Most specifically, we serve the people who are economically struggling the most by a 4.6 percent pay raise, increase in the basic housing allowance, increase in the basic needs allowance, making sure that the price of items at the commissary do not go up so much as to price people out of it.

We support the men and women who serve in the military in this bill, and that is the number one most important role that we have.

This bill also continues on the work that we did on last year's efforts to reform how sexual assault is handled in the military by including sexual harassment in the portions that are under the jurisdiction of the special victim prosecutor.

There is a laundry list of things we do to really improve the quality of life for servicemembers and to exercise our oversight.

This bill also contains a number of other oversight bills; the Intelligence oversight bill, the Foreign Affairs oversight bill, the Coast Guard authorization bill—authorization was the word I was looking for—as well as the Water Resources Development Act.

All told, this bill is Congress exercising its authority to authorize and do oversight of the executive branch on behalf of the American people; and I think that is enormously important.

We are a coequal branch of government. It is our responsibility to exercise that oversight and represent the people.

Now, obviously, the most direct, sort of blunt force way that we do it is through appropriations, the money we spend. That is incredibly important as well.

But the authorizing portion of what we do matters a great deal. It is our opportunity, as individual Members of Congress, to set policy for this country at the Department of Defense, first and foremost but, as I said, also in this bill on intel and foreign affairs and the Coast Guard and elsewhere. It is really important that we get that job done and we do it really, really well.

I can't go through every single item that is in this bill, but I can tell you that just about every Member of this House has something in this bill that is important for policy, important to their district. I know because they have been talking to me for the last 6 months about it.

This is important policy that makes a huge difference for the people of this body and the people of this country, and I would urge us to support it.

I want to say two more quick things before I yield to my partner—actually, three more quick things before I yield to my partner, Mr. ROGERS, on this.

First of all, I really want to thank him, the staff, and everybody involved in all of that. To field that many requests takes a lot of time. The staff on the Armed Services Committee has been outstanding, and we are a bipartisan staff. We work together in a collaborative process.

All of the committee members, Republican and Democrat, have worked well together. Heck, in this moment I will even say something good about the Senate. They worked well with us also in a bipartisan, bicameral way. I really thank them for putting that process together.

Second, I do want to just briefly address, there is always a lot of controversy about issues not within our jurisdiction and whether or not they go into the bill. What has to happen on that is the committees of jurisdiction have to agree. Democrat, Republican, House, Senate, you have got to get all four. If you get all four, great, we are happy to carry it. If you don't, we can't.

I know it is important to you. I know you wish we could, but we can't because we don't have the votes for it. So I hope people understand that as we work with them on those outside issues.

Lastly, I do want to address the vaccine issue, and I want to make a couple of things perfectly clear. Number one, the policy that the Department of Defense put in place in August of 2021 requiring servicemembers to be vaccinated was the absolute right policy.

It saved lives and it improved readiness for the United States military while it was in place because it was absolutely clear that that vaccine made an enormous difference in protecting people from the disease. It was the absolute right policy; that is number one.

Number two, servicemembers who refused to follow that order had to be disciplined. Orders are not optional in the United States military. You cannot function that way, and we are not going to undo that.

But number three, right now, today, what is it, December whatever, in 2022, a policy that says you have to have gotten the first shot, and that is what the policy is that we are undoing in this bill. It says that you have to have gotten that first shot way back in 2021, either one Johnson & Johnson shot or the two-shot Pfizer or Moderna deal.

Right now, the science does not support that that makes you any safer today; it just doesn't.

I urge the Department of Defense to go back now and look at that policy and think about what the right and best policy would be. But it does make sense to repeal that order from August of 2021.

Personally, I would have preferred the Department of Defense do it on their own rather than the legislature telling them to. But since they didn't, I think this makes sense, and I think we ought to do it.

Again, let me just conclude by saying this has been an excellent process. We have a nearly 4,000-page bill that exercises the authorizing and oversight authority of the United States Congress on behalf of the American people. We did it very well.

We have accomplished a lot in this bill. I think every Member of this body can vote for it and feel really good about that. So I urge you to vote "yes," and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 7776, the JAMES INHOFE National Defense Authorization Act.

Providing the authorities and resources our warfighters need to defend our Nation and defeat our adversaries is the greatest responsibility that we have in this Congress. We fulfill that responsibility with this NDAA.

We put our servicemembers first, providing a 4.6 percent pay raise and expanding benefits for military spouses and families.

To counteract the effects of record inflation on our military families, this bill increases housing allowances and lowers prices at commissaries, which offset the skyrocketing costs for rent and food; and it expands eligibility for low-income military families to receive additional allowances to cover basic needs.

This bill also ends the COVID-19 vaccine mandate. The mandate has been needlessly forcing out thousands of talented and experienced servicemembers. I am pleased that we have reached an agreement on this.

This bill is also focused on ensuring our warfighters are the best equipped and trained in the world.

We increase funding for readiness, reversing cuts in military construction and housing projects; expanding training availabilities for servicemembers; and improving the safety of the ships, aircraft, combat vehicles, and facilities where our warfighters serve.

We also divest of over \$6 billion in the legacy systems that do little or nothing to deter China, or our other adversaries.

We reinvest those savings in emerging technologies, such as IA, quantum computing, hypersonic weapons, and autonomous systems. These are the technologies we need to ensure our

warfighters prevail in future battlefields. The threats against us are rapidly evolving.

H.R. 7776 is laser-focused on preparing our military to counter threats from China and our other adversaries. It makes critical investments in new systems capable of surviving in contested environments.

It includes provisions that will further harden our supply chain and industrial base against filtration from China; and it reaffirms our support to allies in the region, especially Taiwan.

Finally, it strengthens our European alliance, as these democracies face grave threats from that crackpot in the Kremlin.

I am very proud that we have, once again, come together in a bipartisan, bicameral fashion to fulfill our constitutional duty and produce a fiscal year 2023 NDAA. I urge all Members to support it.

Also, like the chairman, I thank our staff for doing an incredibly good job of helping pull this together. I couldn't have a better partner in running this committee than Chairman SMITH. So I thank him very much for his leadership.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1215

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Cyber, Innovative Technologies, and Information Systems.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of this year's National Defense Authorization Act.

I want to begin by thanking Chairman SMITH, Ranking Member ROGERS, and Ranking Member BANKS for their leadership on this critical legislation.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Cyber, Innovative Technologies, and Information Systems, I am proud of all of the work that we have done in this year's bill, from cyber, to research and development, to artificial intelligence, as well as our efforts to combat climate change, including shifting towards developing sustainable alternative aviation fuels. It is this subcommittee, in particular, that works to deliver cutting-edge technologies into the hands of the warfighter. For the past 22 years, it has been my job to ensure that our troops never enter a fair fight.

As I prepare to depart from Congress at the end of this year, I will always cherish the opportunity I have had to work across the aisle to provide for our national defense. I thank my colleagues and staff, without whom many of these accomplishments would not be possible. But most of all, I would like to thank each and every servicemember and civilian who has dedicated their life to the U.S. military and protecting our way of life.

To honor their sacrifice, I urge all of my colleagues to support the NDAA.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN).

Mr. LAMBORN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to speak in support of the James N. Inhofe National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2023.

As the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces, there are several provisions I am excited about. The bill directs the establishment of a national hypersonic initiative and requires a strategy to use unconventional capabilities to defeat hypersonic threats.

The bill also fully funds nuclear triad modernization, restores funding for the nuclear sea-launched cruise missile, and prohibits retirement of the B-83 gravity bomb.

It funds two additional Patriot batteries in the Guam defense system, and it advances planning for an East Coast missile defense site.

The NDAA also requires a public strategy for the protection of satellites and directs the establishment of resilient and responsive space capabilities. Additionally, it replenishes American stocks of munitions that have been provided to Ukraine and have begun to be depleted.

Finally, I am very supportive of the provision to rescind the COVID-19 vaccine mandate and end separations, protecting the rights of our servicemembers.

I conclude with one final public thank you to my good friend and colleague, JIM COOPER, for his service and steadfast partnership.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Seapower and Projection Forces.

Mr. COURTNEY. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the bipartisan fiscal year 2023 NDAA.

Madam Speaker, as you know, Article I, Section 8, of the Constitution mandates that Congress "shall provide and maintain a Navy." The Seapower and Projection Forces subcommittee's work does exactly that.

Our mark increased the number of battle force ships from 8 requested to 11 and invests in the workforce and supply chain necessary for their construction. The bill also authorizes the Maritime Administration, for the first time, to buy 10 new-build sealift vessels to recapitalize our National Defense Reserve Fleet built in American shipyards by American workers.

Also included is the first congressional action in support of the AUKUS security agreement between the U.S., Australia, and U.K. which establishes joint nuclear training for U.S. and Australian naval officers, which is critical for an Australian nuclear-powered submarine fleet of their own.

I thank my colleagues on the subcommittee, particularly Ranking Member ROB WITTMAN, our outstanding

staff: Jay Vallario, Kelly Goggin, Dave Sienicki, and Naajidah Khan, and our defense fellow, Lieutenant Logan O'Shea, all who contributed so much to this measure.

I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" and join Chairman SMITH and Ranking Member ROGERS in fulfilling our constitutional duty to our Nation.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WITTMAN).

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. ROGERS for yielding.

Yesterday, we remembered the 81st anniversary of the bombing of Pearl Harbor. The United States was surprised by the audacious Japanese attack and our national security was placed in peril. Times have changed, though, and Japan is now a bedrock ally of the United States today. I can't help but wonder if we learned the hard-earned lessons of Pearl Harbor or whether we are drifting into strategic malaise and will be caught unprepared by another attack on our national security.

Frankly, we are not ready. With a Navy fleet that continues to tread water in overall force structure and an Air Force that continues to cede combat firepower, I am not confident of our trajectory.

That is why I am pleased to have rejected a multitude of reckless national security objectives proposed by the Biden administration. This bill authorizes a 20 percent increase in ship construction, partially rejects an ill-advised divest-to-invest strategy and blocks a multitude of poison pills that were haphazardly tacked on to this legislation.

While this is a good bill worthy of support, I look forward to the next Congress where we can assert with greater certainty a revised trajectory for our national security. We need to better assure our partners and allies and avoid our pre-World War II hubris by decisively deterring future aggressors. We have much work to do.

I thank Ranking Member ROGERS and his leadership during the top-line debate this year. We are adopting his budget vision today, a vision that ensures real growth for defense. I also particularly thank Chairmen SMITH and COURTNEY for their desire to reach bipartisan consensus.

My friends, this is a good bill that advances the national security of the United States. I urge all Members to support the bill.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Readiness.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, the Subcommittee on Readiness continues its works to ensure that our bases and our personnel are prepared for anything, from climate change to floods, fires, housing, and the like.

Mr. Speaker, as I look at you there on the podium, I am saddened. I am

going to miss you. I am going to miss the work that you have done and the extraordinary efforts you have made over your many, many years.

Behind me is another woman who I am also going to miss, JACKIE SPEIER, and JIM COOPER, who is not with us this morning. An extraordinary group of people, the three of you. You have carried this committee. You have carried all of us, and we thank you.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I will concur with my friend and colleague from California. You are going to be missed, not only as a member of our committee but as a Member of this body. We have been fortunate to have had the privilege of serving with you.

Similarly, I would like to recognize my friend and colleague from Missouri, who is also going to be sorely missed. She has been a very valuable member of our committee for a long time and a leader on our committee.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. HARTZLER).

Mrs. HARTZLER. Mr. Speaker, it has been the honor of my life to serve on this committee.

I rise in strong support today of the National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2023.

I thank Ranking Member ROGERS and Chairman SMITH for the work in developing this comprehensive bill. I also thank the TAL subcommittee chairman, Representative NORCROSS, for his leadership and collaboration, not only for this NDAA but over the past several years. This legislation would not have been possible without the hard work and dedication of the entire committee staff, including Kelly Repair; my chief of staff, Chrissi Lee; and Defense Fellow Steve Azab. I appreciate all of their efforts.

The NDAA is always a bipartisan product, and it has been an honor to contribute to the development of these bills for the past 12 years.

As ranking member of the Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces, I am pleased this bill reverses President Biden's cuts to our national security and restores funding for the procurement of vital platforms needed to continue to rebuild and modernize our military.

Specifically, I am pleased that this bill authorizes funding for 8 F/A-18 Super Hornets, to address the Navy's severe strike fighter shortfall; 24 F-15EX aircraft, to ensure the Air Force has both the capability and capacity to meet both current and future threats; and continued investments in Army ammunition facility modernization. This has been a top priority of mine since coming to Congress, and I am pleased at the progress Chairman NORCROSS and I have made in working with the Army to ensure proper investments are made for our ammunition facilities.

Additionally, I am pleased this bill includes language to protect CID train-

ing at Fort Leonard Wood, language to ensure chaplains can use their resources for resiliency and suicide prevention programs, and several programs to combat the threat posed by China.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this with a "yes" vote.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER), the chair of the Subcommittee on Military Personnel.

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, this NDAA moves us forward in reforming the military justice system. We took sexual assault out of the chain of command last year in the NDAA. This year, we take sexual harassment out of the chain, and we require trained investigators who will investigate cases outside the brigade. Both are critical for the safety of military personnel because sexual harassment begets sexual assault.

Suicide in the military is a crisis. This year, I visited bases in Alaska twice that were hit hard by suicide deaths. This bill expands the military and civilian behavioral health workforce. It authorizes cold-weather pay and offers each servicemember stationed in Alaska a paid trip home in 2023.

We need to increase the pay of military childcare center workers. We have 19,000 families on waiting lists and are only using a third of the capacity in our facilities. This bill provides for a study. I hope we will do the right thing and make sure that these childcare providers are making more than those who are flipping burgers at the local restaurant. This bill also preserves crucial leave and paid travel for servicewomen who must go to another State to receive an abortion.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support for this measure. I thank my committee and the personal staff.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I do want to say, I am going to miss the gentlewoman from California. She has been a great member of our committee and has really championed some important issues that she just addressed. We will miss her.

I do want to respond to her last remark and make a point. There is nothing in this bill that authorizes leave and paid travel for servicemembers to get an abortion. There is no policy in place in the Department for this.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. KELLY).

Mr. KELLY of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of Jim Inhofe National Defense Authorization Act. He is my friend, and he will be missed. He also will be missed as the former chairman and ranking member of the Senate Armed Services Committee.

I thank Chairman SMITH and Ranking Member ROGERS for their hard work and my subcommittee friend,

RUBEN GALLEG0, who is the chairman of the Subcommittee on Intelligence and Special Operations.

We have done many things in the area. We have gotten new authorities for them to operate. We have gotten resources for them to operate throughout the world, to help us both in the counterterrorism fight and global power struggle with some of our competitors.

Our Nation faces unprecedented challenges. I am very proud that this includes the COVID mandate being removed, that we will not be losing any more soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines; that we also will not keep recruiting to stay low; that we will have more people who join a force that now is not hitting its commitment goals.

I am committed to free-cost healthcare for all of our servicemembers, which includes our National Guard and Reserve.

I thank Ms. SPEIER, who I served with on the Subcommittee on Military Personnel. We are going to miss her and also you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. NORCROSS), the chair of the Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces.

Mr. NORCROSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman SMITH and Ranking Member ROGERS for what they have done in ushering this through.

The Tactical Air and Land Forces Subcommittee portion of this year's NDAA manages our Nation's security risk and keeps America's land and air forces the best in the world.

I especially thank our ranking member, Mrs. HARTZLER—this will be her last NDAA—for her partnership and always putting America above all others.

Certainly, this is an issue before us. It is a bipartisan bill, and we have the oversight of many programs, including the F-35, while reducing risks to the industrial base, particularly when it comes to munitions.

□ 1230

I can't adequately express my frustrations once again that the buy American provisions that would have strengthened our industrial base have been left out.

Finally, I thank the professional staff who made it possible for what we do here each and every day, and I thank the men and women who built and maintain this great industrial base, the finest military in the world.

Certainly, without my professional staff—Bill, Liz, Heath, Carla, Mike, and Payson—and my personal staff of Katie and Kevin, it wouldn't be possible.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "yes" vote for this bill.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GALLAGHER), my friend and colleague.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I stand before this Chamber today in strong support of this bipartisan defense bill that will help protect this

country and take care of the young men and women who sacrifice for our freedom on a daily basis.

We got a lot of good things done in this year's process. We have an \$858 billion top line, an increase of \$45 billion over President Biden's defense budget request. We continue to support and improve the lives of our servicemembers and military families by authorizing a military basic pay raise of 4.6 percent. We also have \$500 million for additional housing allowances to counteract the skyrocketing cost of rent.

I also support the repeal of DOD's COVID-19 vaccine mandate.

We have a number of provisions looking at improving mental health services for servicemembers and their families.

The conference agreement also reinforces that parents of children attending DOD schools have the right to review curriculum, instructional materials, and disciplinary policies.

Also critically important is ensuring that our professional military education is geared toward warfighting.

I thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER), our chair, for her work with me on looking into the state of our professional military education enterprise and for all the work that we have done together over the last 2 years.

I will end by thanking the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN), as well, for his remarkable service. We worked together on the Cyberspace Solarium Commission. As I like to say, Jim was sounding the alarm about cyberspace before it was cool. He is a remarkable intellectual leader in that regard.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time remains on each side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LANGEVIN). The gentleman from Washington State has 9½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Alabama has 9 minutes remaining.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GALLEG0), the chair of the Intelligence and Special Operations Subcommittee.

Mr. GALLEG0. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 7776, the James M. Inhofe National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2023.

First off, the bill is a win for servicemembers, providing a 4.6 percent pay raise, increased funding for basic housing allowances, and improved women's healthcare.

The bill also authorizes a range of critical provisions to address strategic challenges from China and Russia.

We provide \$6 billion for the European Deterrence Initiative, \$800 million for the Ukraine Security Assistance Initiative, and \$225 million for the Baltic Security Initiative, all of which is much-needed support for Ukraine and our NATO allies and partners.

As chair of the Intelligence and Special Operations Subcommittee, I am

proud of the bipartisan work of our subcommittee members, including historic reforms to the defense intelligence enterprise, Special Operations Forces, and our approach to the issue of civilian harm.

The bill authorizes up to \$50 million to support NATO Special Operations Headquarters, an effort that will improve relationships among Special Operations Forces of NATO countries.

It also establishes an oversight framework for information operations, ensuring that Congress is notified no later than 48 hours after DOD approves a new military information support operation, and the bill delivers on our commitment to address civilian harm.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GALLEG0. Mr. Speaker, it requires the establishment of a civilian protection center of excellence and provides \$25 million to implement the civilian harm mitigation response plan.

Finally, and more importantly, I thank my subcommittee ranking member, TRENT KELLY, for his contribution to this bill and his strong bipartisan work.

I also thank my subcommittee staff, Shannon Green, Craig Greene, Will Braden, and Patrick Nevins, and, of course, my MLA Michelle Shevin-Coetzee and defense fellow Charlie Juhl.

Mr. Speaker, it is a good bill, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ROUZER).

Mr. ROUZER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today not just to support the NDAA but some other provisions that are contained therein, one of which is very important to this country, as well, and that is the Water Resources Development Act of 2022, or WRDA, as we know it.

Continuing the bipartisan, biennial tradition, in May, WRDA 2022 passed the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee by a voice vote. Later in June, it passed this Chamber with an overwhelming vote of 384-37. Since then, of course, we have been working with our Senate colleagues to finalize this very important piece of legislation.

WRDA came together with input from Members from all across the country and is an example of what can happen when Congress works together to find solutions for their constituents and the American public.

This year's WRDA authorizes several Chief's reports, studies, and environmental infrastructure projects. It brings focus and priority to many important projects in my home State of North Carolina and throughout the country to better protect our communities from flooding.

The legislation also supports fundamental Corps missions, such as navigation and storm damage reduction,

which in turn support our economy and help keep the supply chain moving, literally.

I am honored to have had the opportunity to help craft this important bill, with critical input from my colleagues on both sides of the aisle. I especially want to thank Chairman DEFazio and Chair NAPOLITANO, as well as Senate Environment and Public Works Committee Chairman CARPER and Ranking Member CAPITO, for their leadership and work on this vital, very common-sense legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill, and I appreciate their doing so.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mrs. LURIA), the vice chair of the Armed Services Committee.

Mrs. LURIA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of this year's National Defense Authorization Act. This is a product of bipartisan work, from all across Congress, and especially within our Armed Services Committee.

It is a historic investment in our defense. It makes a strong step forward in our important priorities within the Pacific, for some of our most challenging areas of the world, the investments in the Pacific; the continuing assistance to Ukraine; as well as making advancements in shipbuilding and preventing the decommissioning of some ships and platforms that remain relevant in this very challenging time.

We can and should continue to do more in the future, and I trust my colleagues to make those investments as we move forward.

As I wrap up my term here on the Armed Services Committee and in the House, I thank the committee staff on both sides of the aisle, as well as my staff in my congressional office and district office, for their unrelenting focus on the issues that are covered in the NDAA. I am proud to say that we had 23 items in this year's bill that provide significant, tangible results for our national defense, for the Navy, and for the Hampton Roads region.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PFLUGER), my friend and colleague.

Mr. PFLUGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this legislation. I first thank the chairman and the ranking member for focusing our efforts with this piece of legislation on the threats, the most complex threat environment that we have faced, I believe, in our history, and getting rid of things that distracted us, like a vaccine mandate where we saw elite military forces having to make a choice that I believe was unconstitutional. I believe that focus is so necessary right now.

For those that are in Killeen, Texas, in the Fort Hood area, which is home to the largest Active-Duty armored military installation in the free world, you have much-needed military con-

struction funds that are coming to you to enhance your readiness.

For those at Goodfellow Air Force Base, we are proud of the 12,000 airmen, soldiers, sailors, marines, and guardians that are trained there every year in the preparation of intelligence.

We have to remain focused. It is a complex threat environment.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this piece of legislation and the most solemn duty that we face, which is supporting our military men and women and their families.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFazio), the chairman of the full Transportation and Infrastructure Committee.

Mr. DEFazio. Mr. Speaker, today is a historic day for our water resources and for bipartisan and bicameral work in the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a joint explanatory statement to accompany the Water Resources Development Act of 2022 and a letter to Chairman SMITH.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE,

Washington, DC, December 8, 2022.

Hon. ADAM SMITH,  
Chair, House Committee on Armed Services,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN SMITH: I am writing to further explain the intentions of Section 11252, Strategy for Retention of Cuttermen, of the James M. Inhofe National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2023.

In 2020, the Supreme Court of the United States ruled in *Bostock v. Clayton County* (590 U.S. (2020)) that the term "sex" included sexual orientation and gender identity for purposes of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Specifically, the Court determined that "homosexuality and transgender status are inextricably bound up with sex. Not because homosexuality or transgender status are related to sex in some vague sense or because discrimination on these bases has some disparate impact on one sex or another, but because to discriminate on these grounds requires an employer to intentionally treat individual employees differently because of their sex."

This rationale is applicable to a range of laws that prohibit discrimination on the basis of sex or gender. Indeed, federal courts both prior and subsequent to the Court's decision in *Bostock* have determined that our nation's federal laws that prohibit sex or gender discrimination also prohibit discrimination on the basis of gender identity including Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, Section 1557 of the Affordable Care Act, the Fair Housing Act, and the Equal Credit Opportunity Act. The Supreme Court in numerous decisions, such as *United States v. Virginia* (518 U.S. 515 (1996)), has used the terms sex and gender interchangeably.

Our nation's nondiscrimination laws must be construed broadly to achieve Congress' aim of eradicating discrimination. In keeping with these cases and the current understanding of gender, I want to explicitly state on the record that the reference to discrimination based on gender in Section 11252(c) of the James M. Inhofe National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2023 also includes discrimination on the basis of gender identity. I understand that the Coast Guard shares this view and understanding of Section 11252(c).

It is critical that the Coast Guard attract and retain a qualified workforce serving on Coast Guard cutters and that such a workforce includes underrepresented minorities and servicemembers from rural areas. I thank you for including this important section in the NDAA and look forward to reading the Commandant's strategy for retention of cuttermen.

Sincerely,

PETER DEFazio,  
Chair.

JOINT EXPLANATORY STATEMENT TO ACCOMPANY TITLE LXXXI OF DIVISION H OF SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.R. 7776, WITH AN AMENDMENT, THE WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 2022—JAMES M. INHOFE NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2023

H.R. 7776, the Water Resources Development Act of 2022 (WRDA 2022) as passed by the House of Representatives and amended by the Senate is the legislative vehicle for the National Defense Authorization Act of Fiscal Year 2023. This joint explanatory statement, submitted on behalf of Chair Peter DEFazio and Ranking Member Sam Graves of the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and Chair Tom Carper and Ranking Member Shelly Moore CAPITO of the Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works, reflects the view of the bicameral Chairs and Ranking Members responsible for managing negotiations to develop a final version of WRDA 2022, hereafter in this statement referred to as "the managers." This statement of the managers describes the intent of the final legislation and the manner in which provisions in disagreement between the House of Representatives and the Senate have been resolved.

#### BACKGROUND

WRDA 2022 primarily addresses the Civil Works program of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps). The bill supports the nation's global economic competitiveness and environmental resilience by authorizing the Corps to undertake projects, programs, and initiatives in their Civil Works program relating to navigation, ecosystem restoration, flood and coastal storm risk management, hydropower, recreation, emergency management, and water supply.

A water resources development act (WRDA) is the authorizing legislation for the programs and projects of the Corps' Civil Works program. Ideally enacted every two years, such an act is the main vehicle for authorizing water resources development projects to be studied, planned, and developed by the Corps. WRDAs typically authorize new water resources development projects pursuant to completed feasibility study reports from the Chief of Engineers, modifications to existing projects pursuant to reports from the Director of Civil Works, other modifications to existing projects, study authorizations for new projects, the authorization of miscellaneous projects consistent with the Corps' programs that also demonstrate a Federal interest, and other programmatic changes to the Corps' authorities. Projects and programs contained in WRDAs fall within one or more of the Corps' Civil Works' missions and authorities, which include navigation, ecosystem restoration, flood and coastal storm risk management, hydropower, recreation, regulatory, emergency management, and water supply.

#### GENERAL OVERVIEW WRDA 2022

TITLE LXXXI OF DIVISION H IS BROKEN DOWN INTO FOUR SUBTITLES:

Subtitle A addresses general policy changes to the Civil Works program authorities. These changes include, among others:



increased support for coastal-related restoration and infrastructure; enhanced authority for the Corps to modernize projects during the performance of maintenance and emergency repair activities; greater flexibility for non-Federal sponsors of Corps projects; changes to ensure the efficient and effective delivery of water resources development projects, programs, and other assistance, including assistance to Tribal communities, economically disadvantaged communities, and states with water supply concerns; improved accessibility to Corps expertise and increased affordability of Corps projects for economically disadvantaged, rural, and Tribal communities; and increased support for research and development, technical assistance, and planning assistance to states.

Subtitle B authorizes critical new feasibility studies to be conducted by the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works (Secretary), who jointly implements the projects and programs of the Corps with the Chief of Engineers and directs certain existing studies to be expedited to completion. The Secretary is also authorized or directed to complete assessments or reports pertaining to, among other things, dredge capacity, reservoir sedimentation, socially and economically disadvantaged small business concerns, and the economic valuation of preservation of open space, recreational areas, and habitat associated with project lands.

Subtitle C identifies antiquated or outdated projects, and parts of projects, that are no longer needed for a Federal purpose for deauthorization. This subtitle also modifies existing projects and related provisions, including environmental infrastructure authorities, and calls upon the Secretary to expedite the completion of specified projects and studies.

Subtitle D authorizes 25 new projects and six project modifications based on reports submitted to Congress by the Secretary or the Chief of Engineers. These projects address various mission areas of the Corps, including ecosystem restoration, flood and coastal storm risk management, navigation, and water storage for water supply.

#### DISCUSSION ON SPECIFIC WRDA 2022 PROVISIONS

2. The transformative nature of the last four WRDA bills on the Corps' Civil Works program has provided the Corps and non-Federal interests (sponsors) with a tremendous number of new opportunities for advancing projects more quickly. The managers expect the Corps to issue implementation guidance on the new provisions contained within WRDA 2022 in an expeditious and transparent manner, and where appropriate, to solicit the views of, and consult with, a wide array of stakeholders in the formulation of implementation guidance. In that light, the managers direct the Corps to provide periodic, bipartisan briefings to the staffs of the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and the Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works on the status of implementation of WRDA 2022, and any other unimplemented WRDA provision enacted by Congress since 2014, with the first briefing to be hosted no later than 90 days after the date of enactment of WRDA 2022.

Generally, WRDA 2022 authorizes or directs the preparation of several assessments. The managers intend for the Secretary to conduct these assessments at Federal expense. Additionally, it is the managers' expectation that studies included in WRDA 2022 to modify authorized projects prior to or during construction, including studies to extend Federal participation in periodic nourishment, will continue to be initiated without a new start designation, in accordance with well-established budget policy.

WRDA 2022 includes several provisions intended to increase support for economically disadvantaged communities in both rural and urban areas. The managers included this direction to ensure that the Secretary gives equal consideration to economically disadvantaged communities in rural areas and in urban areas when implementing the applicable authorities. The managers do not intend for this direction to affect the Corps' ongoing rulemaking to define the term "economically disadvantaged community."

In addition, in each of the last few WRDAs, Congress has directed the Corps to make greater use of natural and nature-based features and other measures to enhance resilient solutions through all the Corps' missions and authorities. However, despite this clear direction, which is enhanced through additional policy provisions authorized in WRDA 2022, the managers are concerned that these enacted provisions are not being fully implemented by the Corps and directs the Secretary to ensure that the availability and suitability of these approaches are explored in each of the Corps' Districts and Divisions.

WRDA 2022 includes several significant provisions intended to enhance the Corps' authority to formulate, construct, maintain, and repair projects in a manner that holistically addresses the impacts of sea level rise and increasingly frequent and severe extreme weather events. Section 8102 of WRDA 2022 provides the Corps with increased flexibility to modify federally authorized hurricane and storm damage reduction projects during the performance of emergency repair and restoration activities to ensure that they perform adequately in response to changing conditions. In relation to this provision, the managers note that they received a request to authorize the construction of enhancements, including additional gulf side breakwaters, to improve the performance of the Grand Isle and Vicinity, Louisiana Beach Erosion and Hurricane Protection Project, Jefferson Parish, Louisiana. Accordingly, the managers direct the Secretary to consider the changes to section 5(a)(1) of the Act of August 18, 1941 (commonly known as the Flood Control Act of 1941) made by this section when repairing or restoring this project to account for increased storm damage.

Section 8103 of WRDA 2022 includes amendments to section 212 of WRDA 1999 that streamline the authority and incorporate shoreline protection and restoration into its scope. The managers intend for the Secretary to use this authority to give priority consideration to the protection and restoration of shorelines, riverbanks, and streambanks from erosion and other damaging impacts of extreme weather events. While the managers intend for the Secretary to address these hazards using nonstructural measures, natural features, and nature-based features to the maximum extent practicable, the formulation of projects that rely primarily on structural solutions is not precluded. Such solutions, however, must meet traditional economic or life safety justification standards if they do not otherwise satisfy the alternative standard in section 212(d) of WRDA 1999. Finally, while section 212, as amended, provides general authority for the Secretary to initiate studies, the managers do not intend for individually authorized studies, or studies carried out under programmatic authorities such as section 118(b) of WRDA 2020, to be excluded from implementation under the terms of section 212 if such studies otherwise fall within the scope of the section.

Section 8106(a) of WRDA 2022 requires the Corps, when requested by a non-Federal sponsor for a study for flood or hurricane and storm damage reduction, to expand the scope of the study to include the formulation of

measures to address damages attributable to all drivers of flood risk in the study area. When section 8106(a) is applied to a study for flood damage reduction, the federal interest in the formulation of measures to address flood risk in the study area will no longer be limited by the Corps' policy on minimum flows. When section 8106(a) is applied to a study for hurricane and coastal storm damage reduction, the Federal interest in the formulation of measures will extend to drivers of flood risk that do not coincide with coastal storm events, including flooding and erosion associated with sea level rise and so-called "sunny day tides." Further, the managers expect the Secretary to continue to account for the effects of sea level rise, including an increase in the extent, magnitude, and frequency of tidal flooding, in the formulation of both flood and coastal storm risk management and ecosystem restoration projects by fully implementing existing authorities such as section 113 of WRDA 2020.

Additionally, section 8106(b) of WRDA 2022 expands the Secretary's authority to formulate alternatives for any water resources development project, at the request of the non-Federal sponsor for such project, in a manner that increases a community's resilience to drought conditions. This provision will allow the Secretary to include individual measures for water supply and water conservation in a recommendation for a water resources development project as well as to design the water resources development project itself in a manner that maximizes the project's incidental benefits for those purposes.

WRDA 2022 includes several provisions to enhance support for Tribal communities. Section 8111 of WRDA 2022 amends the Tribal Partnership Program established by section 203 of WRDA 2000. The amendments clarify that coastal storm risk management and erosion control projects fall within the program's scope. Additionally, section 8111 provides an alternative standard for justifying flood and coastal storm risk management projects, including erosion control and streambank stabilization projects, when such projects do not otherwise satisfy traditional standards for justification on the basis of economics or life safety.

Section 8113 of WRDA 2022 clarifies the Secretary's authority to develop a comprehensive plan to replace Indian villages, housing sites, and related structures impacted by construction of The Dalles Dam, Bonneville Dam, McNary Dam, and John Day Dam in Washington and Oregon. The managers intend for the Secretary to work with the affected Tribes to develop the plan. With the clarifications made in this Act, section 204 of the Flood Control Act of 1950 should no longer be interpreted as restricting the Corps' authority to provide housing assistance at multiple village sites to mitigate impacts from construction of The Dalles Dam or from the construction of any of the other three dams.

Further, section 8114 of WRDA 2022 amends section 1156 of WRDA 1986 to clarify that the cost share waiver for Tribes and territories is to be applied to reduce only the non-Federal share of study and project costs. In response to this amendment, the managers intend for the Secretary to correct the implementation guidance for section 1119 of WRDA 2016, which mistakenly provides for the waiver amount to be applied to shared study costs instead of the non-Federal share of study costs.

Section 8130 of WRDA 2022 directs the Secretary to develop a strategic plan that identifies opportunities and challenges relating to furthering the policy of the United States to maximize the beneficial use of sediment

obtained from the construction and operation of the Corps' water resources development projects. In carrying out this section, the managers are aware of ongoing scientific research into the use of nutrient-rich dredged materials as a potential source of fertilizer for plant growth. The managers encourage the Corps, through its Engineer Research and Development Center (ERDC), to undertake an assessment on the beneficial use of sediment for such purposes, including an assessment of whether such use is cost-effective, sustainable, and safe for human health and the environment.

Section 8146 of WRDA 2022 authorizes the Secretary to carry out capital improvements for the Washington Aqueduct. The managers intend that the definition of customers found in this section means the existing legal entities that purchase potable water from the Washington Aqueduct, namely the Fairfax County Water Authority, the District of Columbia Water and Sewer Authority, and Arlington County, Virginia.

Section 8152 of WRDA 2022 authorizes the Secretary to provide assistance to pump stations when the failure of such pump stations would demonstrably impact the function of the federally authorized flood or coastal storm risk management project, which includes the impairment to water drainage from areas interior to a federally authorized flood or coastal storm risk management project. Congress directs the Secretary to consider this authority to provide such assistance to the Pointe Celeste Pump Station in Plaquemines Parish, Louisiana.

Section 8154 of WRDA 2022 authorizes the Secretary to carry out a pilot program to evaluate the extent to which the provision of temporary relocation assistance enhances the completeness, effectiveness, efficiency, acceptability, and equitable implementation of nonstructural flood and coastal storm risk management projects involving the elevation or modification of residential structures. The managers intend for the Secretary to offer the non-Federal interest for each project covered by the section an equal opportunity to participate in the program.

Section 8155 of WRDA 2022 directs the Secretary to continue construction projects that exceed or are expected to exceed maximum project cost limits during the period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act and ending on December 31, 2024. Though the Corps is still required to submit all relevant documentation to the House and Senate as required under section 902 of WRDA 1986, section 8155 ensures that supply change disruptions, inflation, and other factors contributing to rapid and unavoidable cost increases do not jeopardize the Corps' ability to execute the increased amounts of funding provided to the agency during this Congress to reinforce the nation's water infrastructure. Finally, in light of the number of Corps projects potentially requiring statutory cost increases that have only recently come to the attention of Congress, section 8155(b) establishes a new, permanent requirement that the Corps notify the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and the Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works of any water resources development project that exceeds or is expected to exceed its maximum cost under section 902 of WRDA 1986.

Section 8158 of WRDA 2022 directs the Secretary to establish a Western Water Cooperative Committee to help mitigate the potential for conflict between the operation of Corps projects and state water rights. A bipartisan coalition of 19 Western Senators wrote to the Office of Management and Budget on September 17, 2019, in opposition to the proposed rulemaking entitled "Use of U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Reservoir

Projects for Domestic, Municipal & Industrial Water Supply" (81 Fed. Reg. 91556 (December 16, 2016)), describing the rule as counter to existing law and court precedent. On January 21, 2020, the proposed rulemaking was withdrawn. The Corps should consult with the participating Western States to ensure, to the maximum extent practicable, that operation of flood control projects in such States is consistent with the principles of the first section of the Act of December 22, 1944, and section 301 of the Water Supply Act of 1958. Furthermore, the Western Water Cooperative Committee shall make recommendations that only apply to the defined list of Western States and ensure that any recommended changes or modifications to policy or regulations for Corps projects would not adversely affect water resources within other states.

Section 8160 of WRDA 2022 modernizes the Corps' authority to carry out research and development activities. Included in this section is a temporary authority for the Corps to utilize transactions other than contracts, cooperative agreements, and grants for purposes of prototype projects. The managers intend for the Corps to expedite implementation of this authority by relying on, to the maximum extent practicable, existing U.S. Department of Defense guidance on other transaction authority.

WRDA 2022 includes several provisions to support and enhance the delivery of public recreation benefits at Corps projects. The Corps operates more recreation areas than any other Federal or State agency, apart from the U.S. Department of the Interior. Nationally, visitors to nearly 600 Corpsmanaged dams and lakes spend an estimated \$12 billion per year and support 500,000 jobs. Lakes managed by the Corps are economic drivers that support local communities. The managers remain concerned with the costs of ongoing operation and maintenance of these public recreation sites, which provide an enormous benefit to the country. Specifically, section 8161 of WRDA 2022 expresses the sense of Congress that the Secretary spend at least 80 percent of the revenue generated by each site on activities for the operation, maintenance, and upkeep of such site to encourage their continued use and economic benefit.

Section 8212 of WRDA 2022 directs the Corps to provide the County of San Luis Obispo, California, with right of first refusal for any potential conveyance of the project for Salinas Dam, California. The managers are aware that the County and the Corps have engaged in negotiations for several years regarding the disposition of the Salinas Dam project and associated infrastructure and reservoir. The managers direct the Corps to engage in a collaborative process with the County with the goal of transferring the facility to the County as expeditiously as possible under conditions that are acceptable to all parties. Further, the managers direct the Corps to not take any action that would preclude the Corps from serving as the Federal agency solely responsible for disposal of the facility unless the County agrees with an alternative approach and the managers are satisfied that all parties are best served by the alternative approach. In addition, the managers direct the Corps to not take any action that would in any way assign responsibility for the facility to any military installation or other Federal agency until collaborative negotiations are complete, and all parties are in agreement with a disposal plan.

Section 8303 of WRDA 2022 includes additional locations to an existing pilot program to utilize forecast informed reservoir operations (FIRO) at Corps owned dams and reservoirs. Additionally, the section authorizes

a new pilot program in the North Atlantic Division. The managers urge the Secretary to ensure that sufficient budgetary resources are allocated to FIRO projects to more fully utilize this process in appropriate situations and to provide for the update of existing water operations control manuals to incorporate FIRO at reservoirs identified under the two pilot programs.

The final version of Section 8327 of WRDA 2022 substantially incorporates the language contained in the original section 309 of the Senate amendment to H.R. 7776. Although an authorization of appropriations has been added to subsection (c) of section 8327 for future major maintenance, the managers do not intend for this paragraph to impose a requirement for additional funds to be appropriated to implement this subsection for the currently planned major maintenance if sufficient amounts are available in the existing allocation for major maintenance of the Indian River Inlet navigation project.

Section 8346 of WRDA 2022 authorizes and directs the Corps to carry out water level management activities as part of the operation and maintenance of the navigation channel projects on the Upper Mississippi River and on the Illinois River (also called the Illinois Waterway) to help redress sedimentation and to improve the quality and quantity of habitat available for fish and wildlife. Because studies have shown that water level management activities carried out by the Corps produce important ecosystem benefits, the managers intend that such activities be routinely carried out and conducted as part of the operations and maintenance of the navigation channels as quickly as possible, and prior to the routine update of water control manuals for the covered projects.

Section 8363 of WRDA 2022 states that the non-Federal interest for the project for hurricane and storm damage risk reduction, Colleton County, South Carolina, may be eligible to receive credit for construction and design work carried out by the non-Federal interest before a partnership agreement is executed for the specified project. The managers have agreed to this language based on the understanding from the Corps that all applicable laws and regulations, including the Davis-Bacon Act, would need to have been complied with for the work of the non-Federal interest to be creditable.

WRDA 2022 authorizes significant new Federal investments in environmental infrastructure for communities across the nation. The managers intend for the Secretary to interpret all environmental infrastructure authorities to include, at a minimum, assistance for water supply storage, distribution, and treatment; wastewater collection and treatment; drainage; stormwater management; surface water resource protection and development; and water quality enhancement. Additional purposes may be expressly authorized for individual programs. With respect to implementation of specific programs, the managers intend for the additional appropriations authorized under section 8376(b)(8) for the environmental infrastructure authority authorized under section 594 of WRDA 1999 to be administered in a manner consistent with the previous funding authorized under section 594. Further, the managers intend for the Water Replenishment District of Southern California to be eligible for assistance under Section 219(f)(93) of WRDA 1992, as amended by section 8375(b)(2)(C) of the WRDA 2022.

#### OTHER POLICY MATTERS

Both the House and Senate committee reports on the chambers' respective WRDA 2022 bills include direction on implementation of previously enacted authorities. To the extent consistent with the Act and this statement, the managers intend for the Secretary

to follow the direction on previously enacted authorities provided in those reports.

In addition to the direction in the House and Senate committee reports on previously enacted authorities, the managers encourage the Corps to continue to explicate comprehensive documentation of benefits in project planning. As the Secretary implements the Principles, Requirements, and Guidelines for Water and Related Land Resources Implementation Studies, as directed by section 110 of WRDA 2020, the managers expect these agency-specific procedures to foster a comprehensive, consistent, and clear assessment in project planning documents that allows for full participation by project sponsors.

Further, the managers seek to clarify the scope of existing authorities for periodic nourishment and mitigation of shore damages attributable to Federal navigation projects.

To the maximum extent practicable, the Secretary is directed to provide periodic nourishment in accordance with subsection (c) of the first section of the Act of August 13, 1946, and subject to section 156 of WRDA 1976, for projects and measures carried out for the purpose of restoring and increasing the resilience of ecosystems to the same extent as periodic nourishment is provided for projects and measures carried out for the purpose of coastal storm risk management.

For all future projects to mitigate shore damage attributable to navigation projects under section 111 of the River and Harbor Act of 1968, the Secretary is instructed that shores damaged by navigation features and projects for which the Corps has assumed responsibility through any method, including the Cape Cod Canal, are eligible for assistance under the section. Although the Cape Cod Canal jetties were initially constructed by private interests, the Cape Cod Canal project has been under Federal control for over 100 years. The Federal Government owns the project and has reconstructed, operated, maintained, repaired, and rehabilitated the project numerous times since acquiring the channel. The project does not have a non-Federal sponsor. This section provides clear authority for the Secretary to implement mitigation measures to address the shore damage caused by the Cape Cod Canal jetties at full Federal expense. The Secretary is directed to exercise this authority without further delay. Further, the Secretary is directed in the future to apply this section in a manner that does not preclude Federal participation in the cost to mitigate damages caused by a navigation project or feature solely because the project or feature was initially constructed by a non-Federal entity.

The managers remain concerned about the impacts of drought to the nation's water supply, including the current drought in the State of California and other arid States. Section 221 of WRDA 2020 directed the Corps to submit a report to Congress on the benefits and consequences of including water supply and water conservation as a primary mission of the Corps. Section 221 of WRDA 2020 directed this report be transmitted to Congress by June 2022; however, the Corps has now significantly missed this statutory deadline on an issue of critical importance to communities concerned about long-term water supply availability. The managers direct the Corps to prioritize and expedite completion of this report, and to provide a bipartisan briefing to the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and the Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works within 90 days of the date of enactment of this Act on the status of such report.

During consideration of WRDA 2022, the managers received a request related to pub-

lic safety at federally authorized hurricane and storm damage reduction projects, such as the project at Cape May Beach in Cape May, New Jersey. The managers encourage the Secretary to work with the State of New Jersey, the non-Federal sponsors of similar hurricane and storm damage reduction projects in the region, and other interested stakeholders and public safety officials to examine whether the rate of head, neck, and spine injuries sustained at Cape May Beach as reported by the New Jersey Department of Health and the City of Cape May Beach Patrol is similar to or differs from those reported at other federally authorized projects in the region.

The managers received a request related to the Corps' use of its existing authority to perform advance maintenance of the nation's federally authorized navigation channels. These channels are essential to keeping the international supply chain open and operating efficiently during this period of economic recovery. The managers strongly urge the Corps to make optimum use of available authorities to ensure that these waterways are adequately maintained and able to accommodate global shipping needs and generate economic benefits during this critical time. The use of advance maintenance can be particularly impactful in channels with high shoaling areas. Over time these areas naturally silt in and are especially vulnerable to the advent of more intense storms, and repeated advance maintenance efforts may be necessary to guard against depth reductions which can lead to draft restrictions for larger global vessels. The managers encourage the Corps to maintain Federal channels at their approved advance maintenance depth.

The managers are aware that the Corps utilizes a wide range of platforms, sensors, and other technologies to conduct a range of research and monitoring activities, including the use of uncrewed platforms and sensor packages. The managers encourage the Secretary, in coordination with the Corps' Engineer Research and Development Center (ERDC), to consider establishing an Uncrewed Systems Innovation Center to ensure the appropriate development and utilization of innovative uncrewed technologies, including autonomous, remotely operated airborne, terrestrial, and maritime vehicle systems.

The managers received a request to consolidate the management of all active Miami-Dade County water resource projects into the Jacksonville District. The managers encourage the Corps to transfer project management of the Miami-Dade Back Bay Coastal Storm Risk Feasibility Management from the Norfolk District to the Jacksonville District.

The managers received several requests related to the potential modification of lock and dam structures on the inland waterways system to allow for remote operations, including concerns with the vulnerability of remote operations to cyber-attacks and the potential impact of remote operations on current Corps' employees. The managers remind the Secretary that section 222(b)(1)(B)(V) of WRDA 2020 set forth a security framework for studies carried out by the Corps. Results from that effort should be used to address cyber security concerns for Corps structures, particularly locks and dams, that utilize remote supervisory control and data acquisition (SCADA) type products for automation control systems as part of the Corps' national security interests. The managers request a bipartisan briefing on these activities. The managers also recognize that remote lock operations along commercial and recreational waterways can increase the availability and capacity of the locks, especially in lower-use waterways, and

can support other economic drivers in counties throughout America. The managers received a request to consider potential expansion of remote operations to additional locations, such as in the Upper Allegheny Locks in Armstrong County, Pennsylvania. However, the managers remind the Secretary of recent Congressional action to statutorily declare Corps' lock and dam employees as inherently governmental and direct the Secretary to report to the managers on any potential workforce impacts of any proposed automation and remote operations activity before they are carried out, and to ensure that any recommendations in a completed study will not result in the loss of jobs for current lock and dam employees.

As part of the Isabella Lake Dam Safety Modification Project in Kern County, California, the Corps is building the U.S. Forest Service a new visitor center to replace a facility that was demolished due to this project. The managers note discussion on this visitor center started a decade ago, but understands the Corps is now in the process of acquiring private property on which to build this facility from a willing seller. Accordingly, the managers support the Corps efforts on this project and direct the Corps to continue to work expeditiously to bring this visitor center to fruition.

The managers direct the Corps to consult with the Indian Wells Valley Groundwater Authority and the Naval Air Weapons Station China Lake to validate proposed solutions to resolve water supply needs and eliminate overdraft in the Indian Wells Valley groundwater basin in California. This validation effort shall review and develop measures needed to provide water supply resiliency in the basin and for the critical Federal defense assets that overlie it, including, but not limited to, the preparation of comprehensive plans for the development, implementation, utilization, conservation, or importation of water, infrastructure needs, and related land resources in the basin. Such plans shall consider the potential and projected water supply needs of the critical defense assets and future growth within the basin. The Corps is directed to report to the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and the Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works within 180 days of enactment of this Act on the validation effort.

The Success Reservoir Enlargement Project was authorized by section 101(b)(4) of WRDA 1999 to improve both flood damage protection and water supply in Tulare County, California. In House Report 116-460, the managers previously encouraged the Corps to advance this project. The managers note their support for this project and continue to encourage the Corps to expedite this project through completion.

The managers received a request related to completion of the Comite Diversion project, Louisiana, authorized as part of the project for flood control, Amite River and Tributaries, Louisiana, pursuant to section 101(11) of WRDA 1992. The managers direct the Secretary and any other relevant agencies to take all steps necessary to ensure completion of the project as quickly as possible. The managers request, within 90 days of the date of the filing of this report, that the Secretary provide a bipartisan briefing on the status of completion of the project.

The Port Fourchon, Belle Pass Channel, Louisiana, navigation project, authorized in WRDA 2020, features as a key component 100 percent beneficial use disposal of project dredge material. The managers are encouraged that progress has been made between the Corps and the non-Federal sponsor in designating a beneficial use disposal site

that will meet National Economic Development goals, as well as satisfy the local community's need for beneficial use disposal at impacted coastal areas. The Corps is expected to provide the non-Federal sponsor with a revised Project Management Plan (PMP), delineating tasks and costs associated with addressing remaining conditions contained in the Port Fourchon, Belle Pass Channel, Louisiana, authorization, including a revised dredge material disposal plan that will designate the beneficial use disposal site. As such, the managers direct the Secretary to negotiate and complete a PMP that is satisfactory to the Secretary and the non-Federal sponsor, including the selection of a beneficial use disposal site agreed upon by the non-Federal sponsor, as soon as possible.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, this bill makes history as the fifth consecutive water resources development bill, the first time in the history of the United States Congress this has been done.

It authorizes 25 construction reports of the Chief of the Corps of Engineers, essential to Portland, Oregon; Tacoma, Washington; Selma, Alabama; and right here in Washington, D.C.

The bill also meets the challenge of climate change, even though some deny it exists, by rebuilding and maintaining critical navigation jetties and breakwaters to dimensions necessary to address sea-level rise and extreme weather events, impacts of coastal storms, and inland flooding. It also addresses future water supply needs in the arid West and works to make communities more resilient.

For the first time in over a decade, it significantly expands the Corps' environmental infrastructure authorities to assist more communities in addressing their drinking water and wastewater needs.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Finally, it also includes the Don Young Coast Guard Authorization Act of 2022, authorizing \$13.6 billion and \$14.5 billion for the next year for much-needed shoreside infrastructure.

It also authorizes a third polar security cutter. The Russians have 20 icebreakers. The Arctic is opening up. We need a third cutter, and then we need the smaller cutters.

I thank Ranking Member GRAVES, Chair NAPOLITANO, Ranking Member ROUZER, Chair CARBAJAL, Ranking Member GIBBS, and all of my staff for their tremendous work on this committee.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I wholeheartedly agree with Mr. DEFAZIO on those icebreakers. It is just inexcusable that we don't have that capability.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers. I reserve the balance of my time until the chairman is ready to close.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I know how hard the chairman works. I

would have preferred the mark of the President's budget, but this is hard fought and hard won.

I thank the chairman for the raise that has been given to our servicemen, their housing allowances. Let me thank him for this important research stream to the historically Black colleges and for Ukraine.

Let me also thank him for what we have fought for in the name of Vanessa Guillen, and that is a new protocol for the sexual assault that occurs in our military branches. Let me not point out a particular one.

Let me also stand on this floor and say hostage Brittney Griner has come home. That is a testament to what America is all about. I thank all those who played a role and indicate that, as she has come home and her family is ecstatic, I remind everyone that former marine Paul Whelan should be brought home, as well.

I thank President Biden for working on making sure there is an authorization bill that really responds to the people of the United States military. I am delighted that the amendments dealing with breast cancer that I offered were included, \$10 million for triple-negative breast cancer. I am delighted for the PTSD funding, \$2.5 million, that I offered, as well, to ensure that the people of the military are taken care of. Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to recognize the importance.

Brittney Griner is home.

Madam Speaker, thank you for this opportunity to express my support for the House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 7776, the National Defense Authorization Act for FY 2023.

Congress has the solemn duty to ensure that those who wear the uniform of the United States—and those civilians who provide logistical and operational support—have the equipment, training, and resources needed to carry out and complete their mission.

And we must never forget that a grateful nation has a sacred obligation, in the words of President Lincoln, "to care for him who has borne the battle, and for his widow and his orphan."

This legislation rises to meet that mandate admirably in myriad ways, from providing a 4.6 percent pay raise for service members to increasing funding for housing, childcare, and improved food for service members.

Importantly, the bill provides over \$131 million in funding for research at HBCUs—a 22.8 percent increase—which improves integration of HBCUs into our country's national defense research and development infrastructure.

These are important measures because, as the DoD is the largest federal agency, the wide scope of activities covered by the NDAA impact every sector of our economy and every facet of American life. The activities funded by the NDAA are, in effect, a microcosm of the activities of the United States, and, as such, they must set the tone for how these issues are to be addressed in our country's other industries and communities.

Of course, the main purpose they serve is to protect our country and strengthen our national defense. So, I am pleased that this bill

reinforces our capacity to meet the challenges posed by Russia's aggression in Ukraine, China's increasing agitation in the South China Sea, non-state terrorist groups, cyber-attacks, and other threats to our country.

I am especially pleased that this bill adopts a modern yet long-term approach to our national defense by embracing innovative strategies, emerging technologies, workforce diversity and inclusion, preparation for asymmetric combat, and operational continuity and resilience.

In furtherance of these essential principles and methods, I offered amendments to the NDAA when it came to the floor of the House in July, and I am very pleased that the legislation before us today includes my amendments which I would like to summarize.

My amendment #191 authorizes a \$2.5 million increase in funding to combat post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD), and I thank my colleagues on the Armed Services Committee for adding the full \$2.5 million increase into this legislation.

PTSD was first brought to public attention in relation to war veterans, but it can result from a variety of traumatic incidents, such as torture, being kidnapped or held captive, bombings, or natural disasters such as floods or earthquakes. According to the NIH, an estimated 3.6 percent of U.S. adults had PTSD in the past year.

People with PTSD may startle easily, become emotionally numb (especially in relation to people with whom they used to be close), lose interest in things they used to enjoy, have trouble feeling affectionate, be irritable, become more aggressive, or even become violent.

Most people with PTSD repeatedly relive the trauma in their thoughts during the day and in nightmares when they sleep. These are called flashbacks. A person having a flashback may lose touch with reality and believe that the traumatic incident is happening all over again.

My amendment recognizes that the soldiers afflicted with PTSD are, first and foremost, human. They carry their experiences with them. Ask a veteran of Vietnam, Iraq, or Afghanistan about the frequency of nightmares they experience, and one will realize that serving in the Armed Forces leaves a lasting impression, whether good or bad.

My amendment will help ensure that "no soldier is left behind" by addressing the urgent need for more outreach toward hard-to-reach veterans suffering from PTSD, especially those who are homeless or reside in underserved urban and rural areas of our country.

My amendment #194 authorizes a \$10 million increase in funding for increased collaboration between the DoD Office of Health and the National Institutes of Health to research and combat Triple Negative Breast Cancer. I am very pleased that my colleagues added the full \$10 million increase into the bill.

As a Member of Congress, a mother, a sister and a spouse, and a breast cancer survivor, I feel a special responsibility to do all I can to ensure that every American can defeat all types of cancer, and especially triple negative breast cancer (TNBC). We must increase our efforts to protect women in the military, and women who are spouses of service members, from this virulent and lethal illness.

The 13–25 percent of breast cancers that are triple-negative disproportionately afflict

Black women. Although the rate of all breast cancers is 10 percent lower in Black women than white women, Black women are 3 times more likely to suffer from triple negative breast cancer than are white women. In 2013, the American Cancer Society estimated that 27,000 Black women are diagnosed with the illness annually.

African American women who are diagnosed with triple negative breast cancer—an especially aggressive type of cancer which often occurs at younger ages than other breast cancers—have a five year survival rate of 78 percent after diagnosis as compared to 90 percent for white women.

The key to beating this cancer is early detection, and the DoD's health care system for women service members and women who are spouses of service members can enable early detection.

A 2007 study of more than 50,000 women with all stages of breast cancer found that 77 percent of women with triple-negative breast cancer survived at least 5 years, versus 93 percent women with other types of breast cancer. Another study of more than 1,600 women published in 2007 found that women with triple-negative breast cancer had a higher risk of death within 5 years of diagnosis.

By prioritizing this very lethal condition, the DoD can make great strides in protecting women from triple negative breast cancer's worst effects.

My amendment #199 directs the Secretary of Defense to ensure that candidates granted admission to attend a military academy undergo screening for speech disorders and be provided appropriate opportunities and supportive services.

Academy students should have the option of undergoing speech therapy to reduce speech disorders or impediments.

I am pleased that Report Language was added that cites the DoD's recent attention to this issue, and states, in part, that the DoD is now "noting the availability of medical waivers in certain circumstances for physical or medical standards, providing the Reading Aloud Test administered to applicants," and very importantly, "describing the availability of speech therapy."

My amendment #195 directs the Secretary of Defense to audit current practices for the administration of sexual harassment claims and submit a report detailing efforts to prevent sexual harassment and protect service members, and compiling data and research on sexual harassment prevalence in the military, cases reported, legal proceedings, and convictions.

Sexual assault is endemic in our military, especially for female service members. Streamlining and auditing the process of reporting sexual assault protects victims and is a necessary step in weeding out abusers.

I am very pleased that this bill advances key reforms to the Uniform Code of Military Justice to prevent sexual harassment and abuse by:

- placing sexual harassment and related sexual offenses in the jurisdiction of the Special Trial Counsel;

- requiring independent trained investigators outside of the immediate chain of command to investigate claims of sexual harassment;

- requiring the randomization of court-martial panels;

- expanding reporting requirements on the implementation of the New Special Trial Counsel program; and

permitting the Secretary of Defense to expand restricted reporting of sexual assault for civilian employees rather than relegating them to only filing unrestricted reports with the military.

In light of these measures to reform the enforcement process against sexual offenses, I am pleased that, as a result of my amendment, Report Language has been added, stating that, "... the matters addressed in this provision are routinely addressed in the Department's Annual Report on Sexual Assault in the Military."

My amendment #190 requires a report to be submitted to Congress within 240 days following enactment on the risks posed by debris in low earth orbit and to make recommendations on remediation of risks and outline plans to reduce the incident of space debris.

Man-made objects in Earth's orbit that become space debris no longer serve a useful function, yet their impact can pose serious risks to personnel in orbiting spacecraft, satellites, and essential systems since they travel at speeds up to 17,500 miles per hour. Space debris includes nonfunctional spacecraft, abandoned launch vehicle stages, mission-related debris, and fragmentation debris.

I am very pleased that my amendment led to inclusion of bill language requiring the Secretary of Defense to respond to a reporting requirement regarding space debris that was included in the Joint Explanatory Statement accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2022 specific to defense and national security space assets.

My amendment #198 requires the National Guard Bureau, in coordination with the Secretary of Defense, to submit to Congress and others in 2023, 2024, and 2025 a report identifying the personnel, training, and equipment needed by the non-federal National Guard to prevent, mitigate, respond to, and recover from natural and man-made disasters.

Hurricane Harvey's impact in Texas was so severe that it lingered for years. The storm's footprint covered over 9,000 square miles, including the city of Houston. Hurricane Harvey dropped over 52 inches of rain in the Houston area. At its peak, one-third of Houston was underwater, leaving 34,575 evacuees in shelters across Texas.

The scope and magnitude of these dueling disasters tested the National Guard and Reservists in unprecedented ways. To prepare for major natural disasters in the future, this amendment requires a readiness report by the National Guard and Reservists to make sure they have what they need to assist communities in need of disaster assistance.

My amendment will help the National Guard help communities prepare for disasters, respond to them, and rebuild from them. It will improve the ability to support the important mission of the National Guard and Reservists to engage in disaster response.

Thus, I am pleased that bill language was included to require the Chief of the National Guard Bureau to include in the National Guard Bureau unfunded priorities list any unfunded priorities related to non-Federal National Guard responsibilities in connection with natural and man-made disasters.

My amendment #197 requires the Secretary of the Navy, not later than 180 days after enactment of this Act, to submit to Congress a report on desalination technology's application for defense and national security pur-

poses to provide drought relief to areas impacted by sharp declines in water resources.

I am pleased my amendment resulted in Report Language stating that, "We are aware of the importance of expeditionary desalinization capabilities to crisis scenarios, including natural disasters. Accordingly, we direct the Secretary of the Navy to provide a report to the congressional defense committees, not later than August 1, 2023, outlining the current inventory and usage of desalinization systems, planned future investments into technologies and systems, and any current and projected future needs for expeditionary water purification that may not be met by current and planned capabilities."

My amendment #189 requires a report to be submitted within 220 days following enactment on the Capacity to Provide Disaster Survivors with Emergency Short Term Housing.

As we witnessed in the aftermath of Hurricane Harvey, as well as other major natural disasters, enormous swaths of the population are displaced, communities are unlivable with no prospect for near-term rebuilding or restoration, and there is an enormous unmet need for emergency housing.

Because of the need to prepare for the consequences of future major natural disasters, I thank my colleagues on the Armed Services Committee for including bill language that effectuates my amendment by directing the development and submission of a report that will help enable disaster survivors to access emergency short term housing.

My amendment #59 recognizes that Black men and women have played an integral role in our nation's defense: from the bravery of Crispus Attucks, an escaped slave, during the Boston Massacre, to today. The amendment would address the historical and current barriers to Black Americans' participation and equal treatment in the Armed Services.

The racial inequality and mistreatment of Black men and women that has historically permeated our military continues to this day, with more than 750 complaints of racial or ethnic discrimination from service members in fiscal year 2020 alone.

But discrimination doesn't exist just within the military rank-and-file, as in FY2020, civilians working in the financial, technical and support sectors of the Army, Air Force and Navy filed 900 complaints of racial discrimination and over 350 complaints of discrimination by skin color, as data from the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission reveals.

According to a report by the Defense Department's Diversity and Inclusion Board, while the enlisted ranks of the active and reserve military were "slightly more racially and ethnically diverse than its U.S. civilian counterparts," the opposite was true for the officer corps.

We owe it to those brave men and women who have proven time and time again to be an integral part of our military to examine the Armed Services' history of discrimination and to determine the necessary steps to repair the harm caused by these inequities.

I am very pleased by the inclusion of report language acknowledging the history of inequities and stating in part, "Therefore, we direct the Secretary of Defense to brief the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives, not later than May 1, 2023, on those current and future efforts in support of a more inclusive force. The brief

shall include resources allocated, lessons learned, how such efforts advance our strategic national security and readiness postures in support of the National Security Strategy and the Department's National Defense Strategy, and any such other information as the Secretary deems appropriate."

My amendment #193 condemns the actions of Boko Haram and directs that the Secretary of State, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense and the Attorney General, submit a report on efforts to combat Boko Haram.

I am pleased that, as a result of my amendment, report language was included stating that, "We direct the Secretary of Defense, not later than June 1, 2023, to brief the congressional defense committees on the activities and initiatives undertaken by the Department of Defense to assist the Government of Nigeria and countries in the Lake Chad Basin to combat Boko Haram, al-Qaeda affiliates, and other terrorist organizations while respecting and protecting human rights and promoting respect for the rule of law."

My amendment #192 requires the Secretary of Defense to report to Congress about programs and procedures that ensure students studying abroad through Department of Defense National Security Education Programs are trained to recognize, resist, and report against recruitment efforts by agents of foreign governments.

Because of the need for American students who are studying abroad to be protected from risks and dangers presented by agents of foreign governments, I am pleased that my amendment has resulted in bill language that effectuates my amendment by requiring that a report developed and submitted to Congress about the programs and procedures that are being undertaken to protect these Americans studying abroad.

My amendment #196 directs the Secretary of Defense to report to Congress in not less than 180 days the actions taken to protect U.S. armed service personnel from armed attacks conducted by militants and terrorists in pursuit of bounties and inducements the agencies, organizations, or entities aligned with the Russian Federation.

I am pleased that my amendment resulted in the inclusion of report language stating in part, "... we direct the Secretary of Defense, not later than June 1, 2023, to provide a briefing to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives on actions taken to protect servicemembers and U.S. personnel from armed attacks conducted in pursuit of bounties or inducements offered by agencies, organizations, or entities aligned with Russia."

Madam Speaker, I applaud my colleagues on the Armed Services Committee, as well as their Senate counterparts, and the committee staff in each chamber for their extraordinary work crafting this extensive, multi-faceted, visionary legislation that will strengthen our national defense both in the current fiscal year and for many years to come.

I would also like to express my appreciation to my colleagues on the committee for recognizing the value that my amendments bring to our national defense infrastructure and maintaining them in the final language that is before us today.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1245

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

There are so many people to thank in this process, and we have done that, and there are a number of Members who are leaving committee, staff members who are leaving, as well. But I do want to take just a moment to thank three Members in particular on the Democratic side: certainly, Mr. LANGEVIN, who is presiding over this appropriately; Ms. SPEIER; and Mr. COOPER, who are our three subcommittee chairs.

During the 4 years that we were in the majority, all three chaired subcommittees, and delivered as much consequential legislation on the Armed Services Committee as I have seen.

The leadership on all the different areas has just been invaluable. It will be very difficult to replace. Certainly, Jim's leadership on the Cyber, Innovative Technologies, and Information Systems Subcommittee—the only thing about it is your subcommittee is a mouthful to keep up with. I would just say "CITI," trying to remember what exactly it all stands for, but it is information technology, it is cyber, it is the guts of what makes our national security apparatus run, basically; the information systems that we have to make sure they are robust, effective, and protected.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to myself.

Mr. COOPER, of course, more than anything brought us the Space Force, and his leadership on space has been invaluable.

Ms. SPEIER's leadership on personnel; I cannot imagine a more tenacious advocate for protecting the men and women who serve in our military than JACKIE SPEIER. Her leadership has delivered real results and made a very strong statement.

All three of you will be sorely missed.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the distinguished Speaker of the House.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank him for his tremendous leadership to protect and defend the American people and our Constitution. I thank the gentleman for his kind words about my colleague from San Francisco, JACKIE SPEIER, for her leadership on behalf of the men and women in uniform.

Mr. Speaker, what an honor it is to speak on this important legislation with you in the chair, a champion for the security of the American people, whether on the Armed Services Committee, the Intelligence Committee, other initiatives, whether it is cybersecurity or the rest, you have been a leader. You have taught us a lot about your areas of expertise and more, and because of you, we were able, on one of

the anniversaries of the ADA, to change the infrastructure of the House so that you could preside.

Mr. Speaker, you were the first to preside, and now as we come to the end of your service and your leadership in the Congress—not in the world—that you should be in the chair is an honor for all of us. You bring honor to this Congress, to that position, and I thank you for your service and your leadership, Mr. LANGEVIN of Rhode Island.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this year's strong bipartisan, bicameral National Defense Authorization Act, the foundation of America's national security priorities.

This legislation honors our fundamental charge under the United States Constitution to provide for the common defense. That is why Democrats have fought tirelessly to invest in our Nation's greatest sources of strength, from our heroic servicemen and -women and their families to promoting American leadership around the globe.

Thanks to the distinguished chair of the Armed Services Committee, ADAM SMITH, as well as the ranking member, MIKE ROGERS, and all the members of the committee and staff for your tireless work assembling this bipartisan, bicameral legislative package. That is what makes it stronger, its bipartisan-ship.

I would like to talk about some of the things that are in the legislation because as our country grows and our needs are greater, the cost goes up, as well. But how those resources are prioritized is very important to our colleagues who are making their vote known to the public to whom we are accountable to understand our definition of strength.

That starts with the deeply deserved 4.6 percent pay raise to help ease the sting of inflation for our men and women in uniform. We are also empowering the Pentagon to raise the basic housing allowance, bringing down food prices by directing more funding to commissaries, and expanding support for childcare services; meaning the personal needs of our personnel are so very important, and this legislation does just that.

Building on the sweeping progress in last year's NDAA to combat sexual assault in the military, this year we require independently trained investigators outside the immediate chain of command to investigate claims of sexual harassment, as well. Our colleague JACKIE SPEIER was so important in all of that.

Importantly, we blocked an anti-choice demand to eliminate the right to travel to access legal abortion for servicemembers stationed in a State that criminalizes reproductive health. Because for Democrats, health freedom is a value for every woman everywhere.

Additionally, this legislation delivers a record amount of funding for research and development at America's HBCUs and steers additional funding to



other minority-serving institutions. This is so important because Democrats—and now Republicans—know that we must build a diverse, inclusive national security workforce, one reflective of our Nation.

By investing in these essential engines of opportunity, we expand the talent pipeline and make sure our Nation's brightest minds will help solve our toughest national security challenges with inclusiveness, with diversity, with our best.

At the same time, we are investing in America's global preeminence. It is a national security imperative to honor our troops with cutting-edge technologies, equipping them to tackle complex 21st century threats. You know this so well, Mr. Speaker, as does our chair and ranking member. We are harnessing the power of clean energy to ensure that our defense facilities and vehicle fleets are resilient to climate change.

Meanwhile, we are nurturing a growing semiconductor industry which we reinvigorated earlier this year with the CHIPS and Science Act.

Now, the NDAA will require government contracts to use chips that are made in America; creating good-paying jobs here at home, securing our supply chains, and bolstering our economic competitiveness.

This year's NDAA also makes robust progress to promote American leadership in the global arena. The safety of families here at home depends on international security and stability.

So with this legislation, we ensure that America and our allies maintain a military and qualitative edge in strategic regions across the world, investing more than \$11 billion in the Pacific Deterrence Initiative; securing more than \$6 billion for the European Deterrence Initiative; and further support for Ukraine's fight for freedom through the Ukraine Security Assistance Initiative.

Indeed, Democrats know that the security of our Nation is not only measured in our military might, but also in the health, strength, and our well-being, and the respect we have for our partners.

As I draw to a conclusion—I didn't say close—I just want to salute the people of Ukraine and President Zelenskyy for their courage. In fighting for their democracy, they are fighting for our democracy and the democracies of their neighbors in Europe, as well, and really throughout the world. So, we have a moral responsibility, as well as a practical one, to support our Ukraine initiatives.

Importantly, there are two additional provisions the Democrats fought to attach to this legislative package. The first is a version of the Federal Firefighters Fairness Act, a long-sought Democratic priority to make it easier for Federally employed firefighters who contract certain diseases to qualify for Federal workers' compensation.

Our firefighters are our nobility. They risk their lives, putting their lives on the line to protect our families, our homes, our communities from devastation. With this provision, we take another step to deliver the benefits they are entitled to that they have earned.

The second initiative, and very consequential, is the oceans package. It is a very important and, I understand, bipartisan initiative closely negotiated with military leaders. This bipartisan legislation is a force for America's national security and economic competitiveness.

Mr. Speaker, 4 in 10 Americans live in coastal counties, and the well-being of every family depends on strong, secure water sources. By taking action to conserve our oceans, coasts, and Great Lakes, we are protecting jobs and businesses, ensuring resilient access to clean water, and preserving invaluable aquatic life and their natural habitat.

Our military leaders repeatedly have told us that the climate crisis is a top threat facing our Nation. The climate crisis is a security issue. So we are also modernizing the NOAA Corps and securing more hurricane hunter aircrafts to help protect communities from extreme weather and climate disaster.

Mr. Speaker, today, we are confronting threats to democracy here and around the world. Again, I would, in closing, once again salute President Zelenskyy and the people of Ukraine. Their fight for democracy is ours, as well. We have not only a moral but also a strategic responsibility to continue to support their fearless fight as we do in this legislation.

In order to uphold our sacred responsibility and ensure that Americans are safe and America is secure, I urge a strong bipartisan vote for the NDAA. Then, we will send it to the Senate and on to the President to become the law of the land. My understanding is that there is agreement between the House and the Senate in a bipartisan way as we send this on.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. ROGERS for his great leadership in all of this.

On a separate note, we are overjoyed that Brittney Griner is on her way home after the President's tireless and focused work to secure her release. Earlier today, we passed the Marriage Protection Act, and we are so happy that she will be joining her wife when she comes home.

Again, Congress remains firmly committed to supporting the administration as it continues to work to secure the release of Paul Whelan and all those who Putin has unjustly detained. I just saw on the news as I was coming over here that Paul Whelan said the President made the right decision to get Brittney, trade for that, and then keep the focus to get him free.

Again, I support Chair SMITH and Ranking Member ROGERS for their great leadership in accomplishing a bipartisan, strong bill that again keeps our country strong and measures our

might in terms of our hardware, of course, but also, in terms of the people who keep us strong. We are deeply in their debt.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a strong bipartisan vote.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I want to close by thanking Chairman SMITH. There is no better partner that I could have, and I am grateful for his leadership.

I also want to thank Chairman REED and Ranking Member INHOFE. As many know, JIM INHOFE is retiring at the end of this Congress. Throughout his decades of service, he has been a consistent champion for our men and women in uniform. It was very fitting and appropriate that we name this year's NDAA after JIM INHOFE.

Finally, I thank our staff on both sides of the aisle for their tireless work on this product. I thank the staff of legislative counsel and the CBO for their tremendous contributions, as well.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday was the 81st anniversary of the devastating attack on Pearl Harbor. In its aftermath, we built the strongest military in the world with a mission to protect the greatest Nation on Earth. This bill before us today will ensure our military can continue to carry out that sacred mission.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to support it, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I can't say it any better than the Speaker said. I think that was just an outstanding summary of the work we have done, why that work matters, and of the policy that we have put forward here.

Once again, we have come together in a bipartisan, bicameral way to pass an excellent piece of legislation that reflects our values and supports the men and women who serve in our military. It gives us the opportunity to meet our national security requirements. It has been an outstanding process with pretty much everybody in this body participating in it in one way or another and producing an outstanding product.

I will close by urging all Members to vote in favor of the National Defense Authorization Act for 2023. I thank everyone for their work, and I urge a "yes" vote.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join Chairman DEFAZIO, Ranking Member GRAVES, and Ranking Member ROUZER in bringing to the floor the bipartisan and bicameral Water Resources Development Act of 2022.

The Water Resources Development Act is our legislative commitment to investing in and protecting our communities from flooding events, restoring our environment and ecosystems, and keeping our Nation's competitiveness by supporting our ports and harbors.

Through the biennial enactment of WRDA legislation, the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee has addressed local, regional, and national needs through authorization of new U.S. Army Corps of Engineers projects, studies, and policies that benefit every corner of the Nation.

We held 4 hearings in preparation for this bill including a Member Day hearing. We had a formal process to receive legislative, policy and project ideas from Members which resulted in over 1,500 ideas submitted to us by Members. I thank all Members for engaging with the Committee on this bill and advocating for the needs of your districts. We were able to incorporate most of the requests from Members into this bill.

I am particularly thankful that we were able to make a commitment in this WRDA to address the needs of tribal and disadvantaged communities. The bill requires the Army Corps of Engineers to improve outreach to these communities by creating liaison programs in each Corps district region across the country. WRDA includes provisions to develop technical assistance programs that provide guidance to tribal communities on water resource projects, identify opportunities and challenges on existing Corps projects, and provide planning assistance for future projects. The bill gives Corps personnel the training and tools to effectively address issues on tribal lands of ancestral, historic, and cultural significance, including burial grounds.

WRDA also continues the effort that we started 10 years ago to improve water supply at Corps dams by addressing managed aquifer replenishment so that dams can hold water for recharge to local ground water basins. The bill addresses the buildup and removal of sediment in reservoirs to improve the operations and capacity of dams. The bill requires the Corps to take a particular focus on infrastructure in the west to evaluate opportunities to improve water management, water supply, and address the impacts of climate change.

The bill continues congress's goal of improving dam safety by assessing the status of all dams maintained by the Corps and determining the needs for rehabilitation, retrofit, or removal.

The bill includes bipartisan legislation Ranking Member ROUZER and I introduced titled H.R. 7762, the Army Corps of Engineers Military Personnel Augmentation Act. It amends an outdated 1956 law, which is prohibitive against current soldiers who have the technical skills to provide engineering support to the civil works mission of the Army Corps.

In 1956, there were very few NCOs with advanced degrees, so it was presumed that only commissioned officers would be properly trained to handle Civil Works responsibilities. However, since that time and the development of the professional army, there are many NCOs, National Guard Officers, and Warrant Officers with advanced engineering and technical skills, and it no longer makes sense to exclude them from positions in Civil Works. This change is supported by the Secretary of the Army, the Chief of Engineers, and the National Guard Association of the United States.

The bill also provides for hundreds of local concerns throughout the country. I am proud that this bill transfers the authorization of 31 debris basins in my region to the Los Angeles County Flood Control District. These debris basins are locally owned, and have been suc-

cessfully operated and maintained by Los Angeles County for decades. This provision will formalize the current operation of these debris basins.

WRDA includes authorizations for the development of stormwater, sewer, and ecosystem restoration projects in the San Gabriel Valley and greater Los Angeles County. This will improve flood protection and boost local water supply at the same time by investing in spreading grounds, dam infrastructure, and treatment operations.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the many people who have helped this bill become a reality. Thank you to the leadership at the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Assistant Secretary Connor, Lieutenant General Spellmon, and their incredible staff who have worked through over a thousand submissions we received for WRDA 2022.

I am very fortunate to have some of the best water leaders in the country in my district and Southern California who provided valuable input for this bill including Col. Julie Balten of the Los Angeles District, Los Angeles County Supervisors Hilda Solis and Kathryn Barger, Los Angeles County Public Works Director Mark Pestrella, California State Assembly Speaker Anthony Rendon, and San Gabriel Valley Watermaster Tony Zampiello.

I would particularly like to thank the Subcommittee Ranking Member DAVID ROUZER for his friendship and collegiality through the hearings and meetings that led to this bipartisan accomplishment. And most importantly I would like to thank the incredible water subcommittee staff including Alexa Williams, Logan Ferree, Michael Bauman, Ryan Seiger, Ryan Hambleton, and the rest of the majority and minority staff.

I urge my colleagues to support WRDA 2022.

Mr. CARSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak in support of the National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA). In addition to critical resources for our defense programs and our service members, this bill also includes two critical bills from the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, the Don Young Coast Guard Reauthorization Act of 2022, and the Water Resources Development Act of 2022. This bill also includes the Intelligence Authorization Act, including my new requirements to address the threat of hypersonic weapons.

The underlying bill also includes my amendment authorizing an increase in funding to fight pancreatic cancer, which sadly claimed the lives of our beloved colleagues John Lewis and Alcee Hastings. The \$5 million dollar increase will help develop better and earlier detection of pancreatic cancer, which will help save lives.

Another provision included in this bill is my amendment to the Federal Firefighters Fairness Act, which improves access to benefits, and provides injured firefighters or their families more time to file documentation for assistance claims.

These are all important provisions, but I'd like to take a few moments now to highlight the long-overdue changes to safety requirements for passenger vessels.

The Coast Guard Reauthorization Act will increase maritime safety and efficiency, including my Duck Boat Safety Improvement Act, which is now Section 11502 in the NDAA. I am especially grateful to Chairman DEFazio for working with me over several years to de-

velop this language, which will finally address the persistent problems with unsafe vessels, and including my Duck Boat Safety Improvement Act in today's NDAA.

My Duck Boat Safety requirements will finally implement safety regulations for amphibious passenger vessels, particularly those known as Duck Boats. These safety recommendations were made by federal agencies to address repeated problems associated with Duck Boats that have resulted in far too many injuries and fatalities that may have been prevented.

I learned about these problems when my constituents in Indianapolis, the Coleman family, were involved in a horrible Duck Boat accident on July 19, 2018 in Branson, Missouri. Tia Coleman was one of only two survivors from her family of 11, losing her husband Glenn, and her children Reece (nine years old), Evan (seven years old), and Arya (one year old). Tia's 13-year-old nephew, Donovan Coleman, was the other surviving family member, losing his mother Angela, his younger brother Maxwell (two years old), his uncles Ervin (76 years old) and Butch (70 years old), and his aunt Belinda (69 years old). Boarding a Duck Boat on Table Rock Lake started out as a fun outing for family members, but it turned into an unspeakable tragedy when the boat capsized and sank. Seventeen of the 31 passengers on board were killed.

The National Transportation Safety Board (NTSB) and U.S. Coast Guard have separately investigated the incident and Congress must act now. We know from past incidents that more can and should be done to make these vessels safer. Since 1999, more than 40 people have died in Duck Boats accidents, the vast majority of them from drowning when the vessel sinks. In 2002, the NTSB issued recommendations to improve the safety of these vessels in flooding or sinking situations, but little has been done to implement those measures—until today.

Duck Boats are hybrid vehicles that can travel on roadways and waterways, so the safety measures must be updated for both land and waterborne operations.

The Duck Boat Safety Improvement Act will require vessel operators to implement common-sense boating safety measures, including:

- Improving reserve buoyancy and watertight compartmentalization to prevent sinking,

- Requiring more monitoring and adherence to severe weather alerts and warnings,

- Requiring release of road safety seatbelts when Duck Boats become waterborne,

- Requiring stronger crew safety training and certification,

- Removing or reconfigure canopies and window coverings for waterborne operations,

- Requiring personal flotation devices for waterborne operations,

- Requiring installation of better bilge pumps and alarms,

- Installing underwater LED lights that activate automatically in emergencies, and

- Complying with other Coast Guard boating safety requirements.

These changes will help save lives and prevent future tragedies.

I hope my colleagues will join me in supporting today's bill to make common-sense corrections to the persistent safety problems facing Duck Boats. If we act today, we can help ensure that no other family has to suffer

the kind of tragedy faced by my constituents on Table Rock Lake.

I urge the House to support these safety provisions, and all of the reauthorizations in this year's NDAA.

□ 1300

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1512.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the yeas have it.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to H. Res. 1512 will be followed by a 5-minute vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass S. 1617.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 350, nays 80, not voting 2, as follows:

[Roll No. 516]

YEAS—350

Adams	Cicilline	Gallagher
Aderholt	Clark (MA)	Gallego
Aguilar	Cleaver	Garamendi
Allen	Clyburn	Garbarino
Allred	Cole	Garcia (CA)
Amodei	Comer	Garcia (TX)
Armstrong	Connolly	Gibbs
Arrington	Conway	Gimenez
Axne	Cornier	Golden
Babin	Correa	Gonzales, Tony
Bacon	Costa	Gonzalez (OH)
Baird	Courtney	Gonzalez,
Balderson	Craig	Vicente
Banks	Crawford	Gooden (TX)
Barr	Crenshaw	Gottheimer
Bass	Crow	Granger
Beatty	Cuellar	Graves (LA)
Bentz	Curtis	Graves (MO)
Bera	Dauids (KS)	Green (TN)
Bergman	Davis, Rodney	Green, Al (TX)
Beyer	Dean	Grijalva
Bice (OK)	DeFazio	Grothman
Bishop (GA)	DeGette	Guest
Blunt Rochester	DeLauro	Guthrie
Boebert	DelBene	Harder (CA)
Bost	Demings	Harshbarger
Bourdeaux	DesJarlais	Hartzler
Boyle, Brendan	Diaz-Balart	Hayes
F.	Dingell	Hern
Brady	Doggett	Herrell
Brown (MD)	Duncan	Herrera Beutler
Brown (OH)	Dunn	Higgins (NY)
Brownley	Ellzey	Hill
Buchanan	Emmer	Himes
Bucshon	Escobar	Hinson
Budd	Eshoo	Hollingsworth
Burgess	Estes	Horsford
Bustos	Evans	Houlahan
Butterfield	Fallon	Hoyer
Calvert	Feenstra	Hudson
Cammack	Ferguson	Huffman
Carbajal	Finstad	Huizenga
Cárdenas	Fischbach	Issa
Carey	Fitzgerald	Jackson
Carl	Fitzpatrick	Jackson Lee
Carson	Fleischmann	Jacobs (CA)
Carter (GA)	Fletcher	Jacobs (NY)
Carter (LA)	Flood	Jeffries
Carter (TX)	Flores	Johnson (GA)
Cartwright	Foster	Johnson (LA)
Case	Fox	Johnson (OH)
Casten	Frankel, Lois	Johnson (SD)
Castor (FL)	Franklin, C.	Johnson (TX)
Castro (TX)	Scott	Jordan
Chabot	Fulcher	Joyce (OH)
Cheney	Gaetz	Joyce (PA)

Kahele	Miller (WV)	Sherman
Kaptur	Miller-Meeks	Sherrill
Katko	Moolenaar	Simpson
Keating	Moore (AL)	Sires
Keller	Moore (UT)	Slotkin
Kelly (IL)	Morelle	Smith (MO)
Kelly (MS)	Moulton	Smith (NE)
Kelly (PA)	Mrvan	Smith (NJ)
Kildee	Mullin	Smith (WA)
Kilmer	Murphy (FL)	Smucker
Kim (CA)	Murphy (NC)	Soto
Kim (NJ)	Napolitano	Spanberger
Kind	Neal	Spartz
Kirkpatrick	Neguse	Speier
Krishnamoorthi	Newhouse	Stansbury
Kuster	Norcross	Stanton
Kustoff	O'Halleran	Staubert
LaHood	Oberholte	Steel
LaMalfa	Owens	Stefanik
Lamb	Palazzo	Steil
Lamborn	Palmer	Stevens
Langevin	Panetta	Stewart
Larsen (WA)	Pappas	Strickland
Larsen (CT)	Pascarell	Suozzi
Latta	Pelosi	Swalwell
LaTurner	Peltola	Taylor
Lawrence	Pence	Tenney
Lawson (FL)	Perlmutter	Thompson (CA)
Lee (NV)	Peters	Thompson (MS)
Leger Fernandez	Pfizer	Thompson (PA)
Lesko	Phillips	Timmons
Letlow	Pingree	Titus
Levin (CA)	Price (NC)	Tonko
Lieu	Quigley	Torres (CA)
Lofgren	Reschenthaler	Torres (NY)
Long	Rice (NY)	Trahan
Loudermilk	Rodgers (WA)	Trone
Lucas	Rogers (AL)	Turner
Luetkemeyer	Rogers (KY)	Underwood
Luria	Rose	Upton
Lynch	Ross	Valadao
Mace	Rouzer	Van Duyne
Malinowski	Roybal-Allard	Vargas
Malliotakis	Ruiz	Veasey
Maloney, Sean	Ruppersberger	Wagner
Manning	Rush	Walberg
Mast	Rutherford	Waltz
Matsui	Ryan (NY)	Wasserman
McBath	Ryan (OH)	Schultz
McCarthy	Salazar	Waters
McCaul	Sánchez	Weber (TX)
McClain	Sarbanes	Webster (FL)
McCollum	Scalise	Wenstrup
McHenry	Scanlon	Westernman
McKinley	Schneider	Wexton
McNerney	Schrier	Wild
Meeks	Scott (VA)	Williams (TX)
Meijer	Scott, Austin	Wilson (FL)
Meng	Scott, David	Wilson (SC)
Meuser	Sempolinski	Wittman
Mfume	Sessions	Womack
Miller (IL)	Sewell	Yakym

NAYS—80

Auchincloss	Garcia (IL)	Ocasio-Cortez
Barragán	Gohmert	Omar
Biggs	Gomez	Pallone
Bilirakis	Good (VA)	Payne
Bishop (NC)	Gosar	Perry
Blumenauer	Greene (GA)	Pocan
Bonamici	Griffith	Porter
Bowman	Harris	Posey
Brooks	Hice (GA)	Pressley
Buck	Higgins (LA)	Raskin
Burchett	Jayapal	Rice (SC)
Bush	Jones	Rosendale
Cawthorn	Khanna	Roy
Cherfilus-	Lee (CA)	Schakowsky
McCormick	Levin (MI)	Schiff
Chu	Lowenthal	Schrader
Clarke (NY)	Maloney,	Schweikert
Cline	Carolyn B.	Steube
Cloud	Mann	Takano
Clyde	Massie	Tiffany
Cohen	McClintock	Tlaib
Davidson	McGovern	Van Drew
Davis, Danny K.	Mooney	Velázquez
DeSaulnier	Moore (WI)	Watson Coleman
Donalds	Nadler	Welch
Doyle, Michael	Nehls	Williams (GA)
F.	Newman	Yarmuth
Españillat	Norman	

NOT VOTING—2

Kinzinger Zeldin

□ 1339

Messrs. SCHRADER and CAWTHORN changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mrs. FLORES, Messrs. CARTER of Texas, STANTON, and RESCHENTHALER changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Axne (Pappas)	Jayapal (Cicilline)	O'Halleran (Pappas)
Baird (Bucshon)	Johnson (LA)	Palazzo (Fleischmann)
Bass (Cicilline)	(Graves (LA))	Pascarell (Pallone)
Beatty (Neguse)	Johnson (OH)	Payne (Pallone)
Brooks (Fleischmann)	(Fulcher)	Peltola (Correa)
Burgess (Weber (TX))	Johnson (TX)	Porter (Neguse)
Cuellar (Correa)	(Pallone)	Pressley (Neguse)
DesJarlais (Fleischmann)	Kahele (Correa)	Rice (SC) (Weber (TX))
Dingell (Pappas)	Khanna (Meng)	Ruppersberger (Sarbanes)
Doyle, Michael (Pallone)	Kirkpatrick (Pallone)	Rush (Beyer)
F. (Pallone)	Lawrence (Garcia (TX))	Ryan (OH) (Correa)
Ferguson (Kustoff)	Lawson (FL)	Sewell (Cicilline)
Gibbs (Smucker)	(Evans)	Simpson (Fulcher)
Gohmert (Weber (TX))	Lieu (Beyer)	Sires (Pallone)
Gomez (Escobar)	Lofgren (Takano)	Suozzi (Cicilline)
Gonzales, Tony (Gimenez)	Long (Fleischmann)	Swalwell (Correa)
Gonzalez (OH)	Loudermilk (Fleischmann)	Titus (Pallone)
(Moore (UT))	Maloney, Sean P.	Wasserman
Gosar (Weber (TX))	(Pappas)	Schultz (Soto)
Hayes (Neguse)	Meeks (Meng)	Welch (Pallone)
Herrera Beutler (Stewart)	(Correa)	Wexton (Beyer)
Huffman (Levin (CA))	Neal (Beyer)	Williams (GA)
Jacobs (NY)	Nehls (Mace)	(McBath)
(Sempolinski)	Newman (Correa)	

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Lasky, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed bills of the following titles in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 3316. An act to provide for certain whistleblower incentives and protections.

S. 4577. An act to improve plain writing and public experience, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agree to the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 3092) entitled “An Act to amend the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act to improve the provision of certain disaster assistance, and for other purposes.”

#### DISASTER ASSISTANCE FOR RURAL COMMUNITIES ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 1617) to modify the requirements for the Administrator of the Small Business Administration relating to declaring a disaster in a rural area, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 406, nays 8, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 517]

YEAS—406

Adams	Courtney	Hartzler
Aderholt	Craig	Hayes
Aguilar	Crawford	Herrell
Allen	Crenshaw	Herrera Beutler
Allred	Crow	Higgins (LA)
Amodei	Cuellar	Higgins (NY)
Armstrong	Davids (KS)	Hill
Arrington	Davidson	Himes
Auchincloss	Davis, Danny K.	Hinson
Axne	Davis, Rodney	Hollingsworth
Babin	Dean	Horsford
Bacon	DeGette	Houlihan
Baird	DeLauro	Hoyer
Balderson	DelBene	Hudson
Banks	Demings	Huffman
Barr	DeSaulnier	Huizenga
Barragán	DesJarlais	Jackson
Bass	Diaz-Balart	Jackson Lee
Beatty	Dingell	Jacobs (CA)
Bentz	Doggett	Jacobs (NY)
Bera	Donalds	Jayapal
Bergman	Doyle, Michael	Jeffries
Beyer	F.	Johnson (GA)
Bice (OK)	Duncan	Johnson (LA)
Bilirakis	Dunn	Johnson (OH)
Bishop (GA)	Ellzey	Johnson (SD)
Bishop (NC)	Emmer	Johnson (TX)
Blumenauer	Escobar	Jones
Blunt Rochester	Eshoo	Jordan
Boebert	Españolat	Joyce (OH)
Bonamici	Estes	Joyce (PA)
Bost	Evans	Kahele
Bourdeaux	Fallon	Kaptur
Bowman	Feenstra	Katko
Brady	Ferguson	Keating
Brooks	Finstad	Keller
Brown (MD)	Fischbach	Kelly (IL)
Brown (OH)	Fitzgerald	Kelly (MS)
Brownley	Fitzpatrick	Kelly (PA)
Buchanan	Fleischmann	Khanna
Buck	Fletcher	Kildee
Bucshon	Flood	Kilmer
Budd	Flores	Kim (CA)
Burchett	Foster	Kim (NJ)
Burgess	Fox	Kind
Bush	Frankel, Lois	Kirkpatrick
Bustos	Franklin, C.	Krishnamoorthi
Butterfield	Scott	Kuster
Calvert	Fulcher	Kustoff
Cammack	Gaetz	LaHood
Carbajal	Gallagher	LaMalfa
Cárdenas	Galleo	Lamb
Carey	Garamendi	Lamborn
Carl	Garbarino	Langevin
Carson	Garcia (CA)	Larsen (WA)
Carter (GA)	Garcia (IL)	Larson (CT)
Carter (LA)	Garcia (TX)	Latta
Carter (TX)	Gibbs	LaTurner
Cartwright	Gimenez	Lawrence
Case	Gohmert	Lawson (FL)
Casten	Golden	Lee (CA)
Castro (TX)	Gomez	Lee (NV)
Cawthorn	Gonzales, Tony	Leger Fernandez
Chabot	Gonzalez (OH)	Lesko
Cheney	Gonzalez,	Letlow
Cherfilus-	Vicente	Levin (CA)
McCormick	Gooden (TX)	Levin (MI)
Chu	Gosar	Lieu
Cicilline	Gottheimer	Lofgren
Clark (MA)	Granger	Long
Clarke (NY)	Graves (LA)	Lowenthal
Cleaver	Graves (MO)	Lucas
Cline	Green (TN)	Luria
Cloud	Green, Al (TX)	Lynch
Clyburn	Greene (GA)	Mace
Clyde	Griffith	Malinowski
Cole	Grijalva	Malliotakis
Comer	Grothman	Maloney
Connolly	Guest	Carolyn B.
Conway	Guthrie	Maloney, Sean
Cooper	Harder (CA)	Mann
Correa	Harris	Manning
Costa	Harshbarger	Mast

Matsui	Phillips	Stauber
McBath	Pingree	Steel
McCarthy	Pocan	Stefanik
McCaul	Porter	Steil
McClain	Posey	Stevens
McClintock	Pressley	Stewart
McCollum	Raskin	Strickland
McGovern	Reschenthaler	Suozzi
McHenry	Rice (NY)	Swalwell
McKinley	Rice (SC)	Takano
McNerney	Rodgers (WA)	Taylor
Meeks	Rogers (AL)	Tenney
Meijer	Rogers (KY)	Thompson (CA)
Meng	Rose	Thompson (MS)
Meuser	Ross	Thompson (PA)
Mfume	Rouzer	Tiffany
Miller (IL)	Roybal-Allard	Timmons
Miller (WV)	Ruiz	Titus
Miller-Meeks	Ruppersberger	Tlaib
Moolenaar	Rush	Tonko
Mooney	Rutherford	Torres (CA)
Moore (AL)	Ryan (NY)	Torres (NY)
Moore (UT)	Ryan (OH)	Trahan
Moore (WI)	Salazar	Trone
Morelle	Sánchez	Turner
Moulton	Sarbanes	Underwood
Mrvan	Scalise	Upton
Mullin	Scanlon	Valadao
Murphy (FL)	Schakowsky	Van Drew
Murphy (NC)	Schiff	Van Duyen
Nadler	Schneider	Vargas
Napolitano	Schrader	Veasey
Neal	Schrier	Velázquez
Neguse	Schweikert	Wagner
Nehls	Scott (VA)	Walberg
Newhouse	Scott, Austin	Waltz
Newman	Scott, David	Wasserman
O'Halleran	Sempolinski	Schultz
Obernolte	Sessions	Waters
Ocasio-Cortez	Sewell	Watson Coleman
Omar	Sherman	Weber (TX)
Owens	Sherrill	Welch
Palazzo	Simpson	Wenstrup
Pallone	Sires	Westerman
Palmer	Slotkin	Wexton
Panetta	Smith (MO)	Wild
Pappas	Smith (NE)	Williams (GA)
Pascrell	Smith (NJ)	Williams (TX)
Payne	Smith (WA)	Wilson (FL)
Peltola	Smucker	Wilson (SC)
Pence	Spanberger	Witman
Perlmutter	Spartz	Womack
Perry	Stansbury	Yakym
Peters	Stanton	
Pfluger		

NAYS—8

Biggs	Loudermilk
Good (VA)	Massie
Hice (GA)	Norman

NOT VOTING—17

Boyle, Brendan	Hern	Quigley
F.	Issa	Speier
Castor (FL)	Kinzinger	Steube
Cohen	Luetkemeyer	Webster (FL)
Curtis	Norcross	Yarmuth
DeFazio	Price (NC)	Zeldin

□ 1354

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Axne (Pappas)	Gibbs (Smucker)	Jayapal
Baird (Bucshon)	Gohmert (Weber (TX))	(Cicilline)
Barr (Wagner)	Gomez (Escobar)	Johnson (LA)
Bass (Cicilline)	Gonzales, Tony	(Graves (LA))
Beatty (Neguse)	(Gimenez)	Johnson (OH)
Brooks	Gonzalez (OH)	(Fulcher)
(Fleischmann)	(Moore (UT))	Johnson (TX)
Burgess (Weber (TX))	Gosar (Weber (TX))	(Pallone)
Cuellar (Correa)	Hayes (Neguse)	Kahele (Correa)
DesJarlais	Herrera Beutler	Kelly (IL)
(Fleischmann)	(Stewart)	(McBath)
Dingell (Pappas)	Huffman (Levin (CA))	Khanna (Meng)
Doyle, Michael	Jacobs (NY)	Kildee (Pappas)
F. (Pallone)	(Sempolinski)	Kind (Beyer)
Ferguson		Kirkpatrick
(Kustoff)		(Pallone)

Lawrence	Napolitano	Ruppersberger
(Garcia (TX))	(Correa)	(Sarbanes)
Lawson (FL)	Neal (Beyer)	Rush (Beyer)
(Evans)	Nehls (Mace)	Ryan (OH)
Lieu (Beyer)	Newman (Correa)	(Correa)
Lofgren	O'Halleran	Sewell (Cicilline)
(Takano)	(Pappas)	Simpson
Long	Palazzo	(Fulcher)
(Fleischmann)	(Fleischmann)	Sires (Pallone)
Loudermilk	Pascarell	Suozzi (Cicilline)
(Fleischmann)	(Pallone)	Swalwell
Maloney,	Payne (Pallone)	(Correa)
Carolyn B.	Peltola (Correa)	Titus (Pallone)
(Meng)	Porter (Neguse)	Wasserman
Maloney, Sean P.	Pressley	Schultz (Soto)
(Pappas)	(Neguse)	Welch (Pallone)
Meeks (Meng)	Rice (SC) (Weber (TX))	Wexton (Beyer)
		Williams (GA)
		(McBath)

DIRECTING THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES TO MAKE A CORRECTION IN THE ENROLLMENT OF THE BILL H.R. 7776

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk a concurrent resolution and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CARTER of Louisiana). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 121

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That in the enrollment of the bill H.R. 7776, the Clerk of the House of Representatives shall make the following correction: Amend the long title so as to read: "An Act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes."*

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1400

GOOD NEWS FROM MCGREGOR ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

(Ms. KAPTUR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to share a good news story from McGregor Elementary School in Toledo, Ohio. For her fourth grade class' end-of-the-year project, a 10-year-old student named Brooklyn dressed up as me, read up on congressional history, and shared all she had learned with her fellow students about Congress.

Just recently, I had the pleasure of visiting Brooklyn and her fellow students to hear all about how their fifth-grade year is going. What a surprise it was to open my mailbox the other day and discover so many thoughtful, handwritten notes mailed to me by these wonderful students.

I saw close-up, firsthand how bright, artistic, and precocious our aspiring generation in America really is. One young man named Henry wrote: "I decided to write this letter because no one is going to tell me not to."

This moment of winter wonderment is a good time to take stock of all that has occurred over the past year. As we enter this holiday season, I am reminded of so many very kind people for whom I am grateful, particularly the joy of the children at McGregor Elementary School in Toledo, Ohio.

Happy holidays to all, and may the upcoming year bring endless joy and light.

#### HONORING COACH SHARI CAMPBELL

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Coach Shari Campbell of Clarion, who was inducted into the Pennsylvania Volleyball Coaches Association Hall of Fame for 2022.

Coach Campbell has a distinguished career of leading women's volleyball teams to victory as coach of both the Clarion Area Bobcats and the Clarion Limestone Lions volleyball teams.

Coach Campbell has also had a uniquely impressive coaching record, earning 437 wins for her team out of 507 games. Additionally, Shari Campbell's teams have won three PIAA state championships in 2012, 2020, and 2021.

Shari Campbell got her start in 1990 as a junior coach at Juniata College in Huntingdon, Pennsylvania. She later became an assistant coach at St. Bonaventure University in Allegheny, New York.

Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate Coach Shari Campbell on her outstanding achievement. Most importantly, I thank her for being a coach and mentor for the young women of Clarion. Her commitment to her students is not just demonstrated by her record of wins, but also by her dedication and commitment to seeing her players succeed on and off the court.

#### THANKING KASSIE STAGNER

(Mr. TAKANO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to thank a member of my staff on the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, who will not be continuing with us into the next Congress.

Kassie Stagner has served our committee both as a clerk and a research assistant. During her time on staff, she has also shown a willingness to go the extra mile, take on any job that needs doing, and to do so with incredible attention to detail. Her work proved invaluable to many of the committee's

oversight investigations. Through long days and hard projects, Kassie brought a sense of humor and a Texas charm to everything she did.

The work of my committee, this Congress, and our government to honor and to support our veterans was made better by Kassie's service, and she will be deeply missed.

#### IN SUPPORT OF THE RELEASE OF PAUL WHELAN

(Mr. WALBERG asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, we learned this morning of a prisoner swap with the Kremlin: basketball star Brittney Griner for the merchant of death, Viktor Bout.

Left behind once again by this administration was Michigander Paul Whelan.

While we rejoice with the Griner family, Paul's parents, constituents in my district, will soon have their fourth Christmas without their son.

Paul's family is doing their best to stay upbeat and is genuinely happy for the Griner family, as we all are. But it is hard to fathom the magnitude of disappointment with this latest lopsided swap.

We are keeping the Whelans in our prayers, just as we are keeping up the pressure. For years now, I have spoken about Paul's wrongful imprisonment on this floor. I was hoping the next time would be to celebrate his release. Sadly, it is not.

Today, once again, it is time for Paul Whelan to come home.

#### RECOGNIZING PENNSYLVANIA SENATOR PAT BROWNE

(Ms. WILD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. WILD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the work of, and to wish a happy birthday to, Allentown's outgoing State Senator Pat Browne.

Over the span of his 28 years in public service, Pat Browne represented the Lehigh Valley in the Pennsylvania House of Representatives and in the Senate, ascending to chair of the Senate Appropriations Committee.

While we did not agree on every issue, Senator Browne's dedication to Allentown's school district and the city's revitalization earned him popularity with Republicans, Democrats, and Independents alike, something that is altogether too rare in today's political environment. It has been an honor to work with his office over the past 4 years to bring resources to our community, and I thank him for his service and wish him a very happy birthday.

#### CONGRATULATING ROSS SHEPPARD

(Mr. CARTER of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the

House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Ross Sheppard for his recent selection to the Georgia 40 Under 40 list.

Ross is a successful real estate agent who wants to help buyers and sellers understand the value that historic preservation brings to the housing markets.

While many people view historic preservation and real estate development as conflicting ideas, Ross sees it differently. His desire to show people that preservation is a sustainable economic path for real estate has led him into philanthropic pursuits.

A member of the Georgia Trust and the Historic Savannah Foundation, a board member of Georgia's Old Capital Heritage Center, and a former board member of the Flannery O'Connor Andalusia Foundation, Sheppard's passion for preservation is a leading force in his life.

He has renovated and rehabilitated several historic homes, with one of his projects being featured on HGTV's "Life Under Renovation."

He was chosen as Humanitarian of the Year by his alma mater, Georgia College, and has endowed a scholarship there.

Ross resides in Savannah's Landmark Historic District, one of the most beautiful parts of Georgia's First Congressional District. He leads a life dedicated to showing others the beauty that lies beneath the surface by championing historic preservation.

I, on behalf of the entire First Congressional District of Georgia, congratulate him for his outstanding service to this State and his selection to the Georgia 40 Under 40 list.

#### PROTECTING MARRIAGE EQUALITY

(Ms. JACOBS of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACOBS of California. Mr. Speaker, this summer I officiated my brother's wedding, and it was one of the proudest moments of my life.

The love that Dylan and Kay share is incredibly special and deserves to be celebrated, recognized, and protected.

That is why I am so grateful to have voted for the Respect for Marriage Act, to honor their marriage and so many other marriages that have been created and affirmed in the 7 years since the landmark Obergefell ruling. This means so much not only to my family, but to the LGBTQ+ communities in San Diego and across the country.

This bill will take the discriminatory Defense of Marriage Act off the books, so it no longer poses an existential threat to LGBTQ+ families.

It will protect marriage equality so that a valid marriage in one State is recognized by all other States. Importantly, it will protect kids from discriminatory State laws and ensure that LGBTQ+ families can stay together.

With the passage of this bill, our government is finally catching up to the American people. This is long overdue, but it is no less meaningful for my brother and sister-in-law and hundreds of thousands of other LGBTQ+ marriages across the country.

#### CONTINUING TO FIGHT FOR PAUL WHELEN

(Mrs. KIM of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. KIM of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join the Whelan family to urge the Biden administration to get United States Marine veteran, Paul Whelan, safely home from being held hostage and wrongfully detained by Russia.

While we are glad to welcome Brittney Griner safely home to her family, to make it happen, the Biden administration ceded leverage and released a dangerous, convicted arms dealer who was in prison for conspiring to kill Americans.

This poses tremendous national security risks and will embolden Vladimir Putin to take more Americans hostage in the future.

Meanwhile, Paul Whelan and other wrongfully detained Americans remain imprisoned. I will continue to fight for their safe return home.

#### ONE OF THE PROUDEST VOTES I WILL EVER CAST

(Mr. JONES asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, today, I cast one of the proudest votes I will ever cast in this body. I was a "yea" on the Respect for Marriage Act.

When I was elected to this body, I became one of the first two openly gay Black Members ever to serve in Congress. Growing up closeted, I never imagined that Congress would pass a bill like this, or I would be in a position to introduce it with Representative NADLER.

I was too young to remember Congress passing the Defense of Marriage Act, but I know exactly where I was when the Supreme Court struck it down in the *United States v. Windsor*. I had just graduated law school, and I was studying for the bar exam. At the time, because of moderates like Justice Kennedy, I still had faith that the Supreme Court was committed to protecting my basic civil rights as a gay American.

That was a different Supreme Court than the one we have today. The far-right supermajority on the Supreme Court is on a rampage against fundamental rights. As members of the LGBTQ+ community prepare to face the worst assault on our rights in a decade, Congress must do whatever it takes to protect our humanity.

This bill is a great first step. It ensures that the Federal Government will

not discriminate against same-sex and interracial couples who have been legally married. But Congress must also pass other legislation to ensure marriage equality as the law of the land.

Mr. Speaker, I would conclude by simply saying that I am very grateful to this Congress and to be in this place.

#### BIG TECH CENSORSHIP

(Mr. LAMALFA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, in 2019, Hunter Biden foolishly abandoned a laptop at a computer repair store, a laptop that revealed Joe Biden was fully aware of his son's foreign corrupt business dealings. Not only that, but Hunter's business also profited President Biden financially and influenced foreign policy.

But the American people weren't allowed to know this before electing Joe Biden to the Presidency. Why? Because Twitter, one of the most influential distributors of content in the world, deliberately and arbitrarily suppressed news coverage to suit the political persuasions of its employees.

We have undeniable proof that Big Tech censored bad press for the Biden administration right before the 2020 election and may have even profited from doing so. This despicable collusion between liberal politics and social media, put on full display in the Twitter files, must end.

Informed voters, not biased Twitter truth manipulators, must decide the outcomes of elections.

We will never know how many voters would have changed their mind if they knew of the corruption of the Biden family and their activities. Suppression of information is the real threat to our republic, not asking questions.

Now that Republicans are back in the majority in the House, we will investigate this interference and hold Big Tech, the FBI, and the Biden family accountable.

#### VOTING TO PROTECT MARRIAGE EQUALITY

(Ms. LEE of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to thank this body for full support of, of course, H.R. 8404, the Respect for Marriage Act. I was so proud to support this bill.

I thank my good friend and colleague Chairman NADLER for his leadership and DAVID CICILLINE and Speaker PELOSI for bringing this important bill to the floor.

Today, I voted to protect marriage equality across the country. Following the Supreme Court's shameful decision to overturn *Roe v. Wade*, rightwing extremists, who have been visibly organizing for decades to curtail hard-won

rights, have set their sights on other freedoms.

We cannot let Justice Clarence Thomas even consider overturning the constitutional right to marriage equality. What is coming next?

Today, the bipartisan Respect for Marriage Act will enshrine marriage equality into Federal law.

As one of the founding members of the Equality Caucus, along with my good friend Congressman Barney Frank, today, I am reminded of Martin Luther King's profound insight when he said that "the arc of the moral universe is long, but it bends toward justice."

I thank all those who voted for this. This is a historic day, and we did the right thing. Thank God we are moving forward in this country.

□ 1415

#### PAT SMITH WILL BE GREATLY MISSED

(Ms. FOXX asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, there are many wonderful people who work in and around the House to help us do the people's business. Some are very visible, and some are less so. Often the less visible are some of the most valuable in many ways.

One of those people is Patricia Smith, Pat, who is a true patriot and works hard every day to serve others. Ms. Pat prepares and serves food in the Republican Cloakroom. She is unfailingly sweet and caring, not only to Members but to everyone.

In addition to her service in the House, Ms. Pat serves at her church and volunteers on weekends, feeding the homeless. She lives her faith every minute of every day.

As Saint Francis said: Preach a sermon every day. When necessary, use words.

Ms. Pat does not need to use words. She lives the Gospel every day. She will soon be retiring, and she will be greatly missed.

Congratulations, Ms. Pat, on a life well lived. I will miss you and your example more than you can know.

#### TODAY IS HISTORIC

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, this is a very historic day.

We overturned and dismissed the words of Justice Thomas that the rights of Americans should be denied.

We voted for the Respect for Marriage Act that will be signed by the President of the United States.

Then in the midst of darkness, Brittney Griner was swapped and is on her way home. Negotiations by the hostage negotiating team took months because Mr. Putin would not negotiate.



Finding our hostages and bringing them home is not a partisan issue. I love Paul Whelan and his family. We introduced legislation passed by the House that said to bring Brittney Griner home and bring Paul Whelan home.

I am happy for Cherelle, Brittney's mother and father, Houston, Phoenix, the Nation, and all the players in the WNBA, but we will continue to use the power of the sovereign United States to bring Paul Whelan home, as we did Trevor Reed and as we did those who came from Venezuela.

Let us unify together. Let us celebrate Brittney and fight to bring Paul Whelan home.

#### DARK DAYS OF SLAVERY IN AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2021, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, and still I rise.

At this time, prior to going into my message, I yield such time as he may consume to the Honorable MARK TAKANO, the pride of California's 41st District and the chair of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

THANKING TORIA SULLIVAN

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for his generous yield.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to thank a member of my staff on the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs who will not be continuing with us into the next Congress.

Toria Sullivan brought a deep passion for helping veterans to my committee and always provided a kind and empathetic ear to those who contacted our office seeking assistance.

She brought calm and order to a fast-moving office, where the next urgent move was always right around the corner. She was unfailingly helpful and went above and beyond expectations as part of the committee's communications team.

The work of my committee, this Congress, and our government to honor and support our veterans was made better by Toria's service, and she will be deeply missed.

THANKING HEATHER O'BEIRNE KELLY

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to thank a member of my staff on the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs who will not be continuing with us into the next Congress.

Dr. Heather O'Beirne Kelly brought 20 years of experience as a psychologist to her critical role with the Health Subcommittee. She spearheaded my committee's work on veterans' mental health and suicide prevention and drafted key portions of some of the most important legislation passed by the committee, including the Veterans

COMPACT Act, the STRONG Veterans Act, and the VIPER Act.

Even as she grappled with incredibly difficult policy challenges, Heather was a joyful presence in our office who made every day better for her coworkers.

The work of my committee, this Congress, and our government to honor and support our veterans was made better by Heather's service, and she will be deeply missed.

THANKING ESTI LAMONACA

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to thank a member of my staff on the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs who will not be continuing with us into the next Congress.

Esti Lamonaca is an Army veteran who lives and breathes veterans advocacy and who brought deep insight and tireless passion to the committee's efforts to support women veterans.

As the lead for the Women Veterans Task Force during this Congress, Esti organized a series of important task force events. The oversight work they undertook will guide the committee's work on behalf of women veterans for years to come, and Esti's commitment to this work will continue to inspire those who worked with them.

The work of my committee, this Congress, and our government to honor and support our veterans was made better by Esti's service, and they will be deeply missed.

THANKING MATT TYRELL

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to thank a member of my staff on the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs who will not be continuing with us into the next Congress.

Matt Tyrell came to our committee from the Department of Veterans Affairs, and his experience within that organization proved invaluable to our work. He spent months engaging with stakeholders, drafting language, and laying the careful groundwork needed to pass the Honoring our PACT Act, one of the most important pieces of legislation to come out of this Congress. Even while accomplishing such a Herculean task, he never failed to bring collegiality and good humor to his work.

The work of my committee, this Congress, and our government to honor and support our veterans was made better by Matt's service, and he will be deeply missed.

THANKING PETER TYLER

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to thank a member of my staff on the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs who will not be continuing with us into the next Congress.

Peter Tyler is a former member of the Navy Reserve and an experienced Hill staffer who brought considerable skill and oversight experience to my committee. He led many of our efforts to make the Veterans Administration a welcoming place for all who served our Nation and to protect veterans and their families from abusive debt collec-

tion practices by improving administrative processes at the VA.

Peter's passion for good government shone through in every task he took on for the committee.

The work of my committee, this Congress, and our government to honor and support our veterans was made better by Peter's service, and he will be deeply missed.

THANKING MATT HOROWITZ

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to thank a member of my staff on the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs who will not be continuing with us into the next Congress.

Matt Horowitz brought real-world experience in technology and cybersecurity to my committee's work and broadened the scope of our oversight efforts into this important, complex, and often overlooked area.

His deep knowledge, patience, and good humor also helped my committee become a model to others as Congress adjusted to the need for remote work and virtual hearings during the pandemic. He expanded the work the committee does and helped us do it better during a very challenging time.

The work of my committee, this Congress, and our government to honor and support our veterans was made better by Matt's service, and he will be deeply missed.

THANKING JOEL WALSH

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to thank a member of my staff on the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs who will not be continuing with us into the next Congress.

Joel Walsh has been an important part of my committee's oversight and investigations team, and he brought skills to his job that he honed while working as a journalist. His professionalism, writing and investigation skills, and work ethic proved invaluable to the committee as he helped lead hearings and draft important records.

Joel's sincerity and good humor made my committee a better place to work and also made our work better.

The work of my committee, this Congress, and our government to honor and support our veterans was made better by Joel's service, and he will be deeply missed.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for his generosity of spirit and for his collegiality.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, and still I rise, a proud, liberated Democrat, unbought, unbossed, and unafraid to speak truth to power as well as truth about power concerning the topic of slavery and the need for atonement.

Let's start with slavery and identify it for what it was. A proper identification of slavery would cause one to conclude that it was truly one of the greatest crimes ever committed against humanity.

Slavery was kidnapping. People were stolen from their homes. They were traversed across the oceans.

Slavery was murder because in the process of transferring persons, if they became unruly, unmanageable, they could simply be thrown overboard into the shark-infested waters. In fact, it is said that sharks would follow the ships knowing that, at some point, a body might be thrown over that they could feed upon.

Slavery was robbery. People had their identities stolen from them. People were put in a position such that they could not know who they were in terms of their connection to the past, and they could not get an education about what the world was all about.

Slavery was rape. It was not unusual for the masters to rape the women. It was not unusual for them to father the children, and then for those children to become slaves.

Slavery was about the enslavement of babies. What kind of people would do such a dastardly thing as to enslave babies?

The people who would do this were the people who didn't see the human beings, the human qualities associated with slavery. They just saw them as chattel, something to be traded, something to be used, and something to be discarded.

Slavery was also about forced labor. I would like to say more about this topic of forced labor and slavery because I happen to have the good fortune to be the chair of the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations of the Financial Services Committee.

I serve under the leadership of the Honorable MAXINE WATERS, who is one of the most courageous Members of Congress. Under her leadership, we have had hearings on this question of slavery and how this slavery, this evil, has impacted not only the people of that time when they were enslaved but also the people of this time.

Mr. Speaker, it is a very sensitive topic, and it deserves our attention. For those who desire not to give it attention, there are places for them to have their conversations off the floor. I beg that they would do so. It is a very sensitive topic.

□ 1430

We have held hearings on this topic, and at these hearings we have discovered that there are institutions that have a historical connection to slavery. These institutions include our mega banks. I will call them "big banks." They include mega insurance companies. I will call them "big insurance companies."

These mega banks, these big banks, these big insurance companies have predecessor institutions, predecessor banks and insurance companies, that actually engaged in the slave trade by way of with banks insuring slaves as chattel, and the insurance companies would insure them, and the banks would make loans against slaves as chattel.

Let me give some examples. One big bank had a predecessor bank that was

found to have had a connection to chattel slavery by accepting 8,149 enslaved people as collateral for loans and coming into possession of 437 enslaved people.

Another predecessor bank accepted approximately 13,000 enslaved people as collateral for loans as well as took possession of approximately 1,250 enslaved people upon default.

Mr. Speaker, it might be worthy of noting that these predecessor banks were located in our State. I was born in Louisiana. You represent a great Congressional District in Louisiana. Predecessor banks that took possession of approximately 1,250 enslaved people upon default on loans.

Another predecessor bank made a loan of \$135,000 to a railroad company to use slave labor. Adjusted for inflation, \$135,000 is worth approximately \$4,776,840 in 2022.

Another predecessor bank accepted enslaved people as collateral in at least 24 transactions, took possession of enslaved people upon default on loans, and engaged in business and investments with the Confederacy that by 1862 exceeded \$1.5 million. That amount is worth \$44,000,230 in 2022.

Mr. Speaker, as a proud descendent of enslaved people, I cannot in good conscience allow these transgressions to go unchallenged, to allow them to continue without atonement. There are some things that we ought not allow to remain a part of our history without proper redress. The enslavement of people and the profits that were made off of these people as slaves is something that must be redressed. These big banks and these big insurance companies have a duty, responsibility, and an obligation to atone for their connectivity to slavery.

As a result, Mr. Speaker, I plan to file a big banks' and big insurance companies' atonement legislation, a piece of legislation that will address the injustices that were perpetrated upon human beings, the greatest crime against humanity, that we call slavery.

This piece of legislation will require these big banks to assess whether their institutions, their predecessor institutions had direct or indirect ties to or profited from the institution of slavery. We already know that some did. They will have to issue a report containing all findings and determinations made in carrying out the assessments required, and to the extent the institutions, these big banks and these big insurance companies, identify ties to or profits from the institution of slavery a disclosure of the steps these institutions have taken to reconcile such profits and ties shall be reported. This report will be made available to the public, including on a website of each of the institutions making the reports.

Further, this legislation will require a fine to be imposed on any institution that fails to issue a report as required or that reports false, misleading, or inaccurate information on such a report. They shall be fined \$20,000 per day until

the report is issued properly or until the report is corrected to not be false, misleading, or inaccurate.

Mr. Speaker, this is a part of the process necessary for great a nation—and ours is a great nation—to be an even greater nation after it has properly reconciled for its greatest sin, its seminal sin of slavery; as I have indicated one of the greatest crimes ever committed against humanity, a crime that has implications on this very day and will have implications on tomorrow in a very negative way.

We still have people who are suffering from these crimes that were committed centuries ago. Slavery didn't end all of the suffering. After slavery we had Black codes, which allowed Black people to be arrested and then forced to work as persons who were leased. It was called "convict leasing." You could be arrested for something as simple as not having a job and then forced to work. Many people worked until they died; literally, they would work them to death.

In Texas we have discovered a grave of 95 such people known as the Sugar Land 95, a common grave with persons who were slave laborers.

It didn't end there. It went on to have persons who were discriminated against lawfully in this country because we had segregation. Segregation was another means of maintaining people of African ancestry as second-class citizens, people who were not entitled to the same privileges and opportunities as others.

But it didn't end there. We then suffered from—and still to this day—suffered from invidious discrimination. Yes, there are some people who say that it doesn't exist, but it does. There is invidious discrimination in the House of Representatives. Invidious discrimination, discrimination that keeps people from reaching their potential because of who they happen to be.

In fact, our failure to recognize marriage as we have voted to do so today was a form of invidious discrimination.

So it doesn't just consume people of African ancestry. I am making that the topic today. On some future occasion I will be talking about the invidious discrimination perpetrated against others, but today as it relates to African Americans there is still invidious discrimination in our country.

African Americans were not given the same opportunities to acquire wealth. Over the centuries, we have had circumstances where in this country you could acquire wealth by simply going out in the West and fencing in as much property as you could, buy a Winchester rifle, defend it, and it was yours. You could simply squat and acquire land. People of African ancestry were not given the opportunity to acquire land in this fashion.

When the GI Bill was passed, many people benefited from it. Very few of them were of African ancestry. People who fought, many of them died, but

people who fought and survived and came back could not get the same loans, the same grants, the same opportunities as others. So the opportunity to build wealth has been denied, and that opportunity denied has manifested in a wealth gap that is unimaginable with Black people having pennies on the dollar for the many dollars that White people have in terms of wealth.

This wealth gap is something that cannot be ignored, and atonement has to be a methodology by which we achieve a bringing together, a closing of the wealth gap, if you will. And until we close the wealth gap we have to continue to require atonement.

Now, there are many people who conclude that atonement and just talking about slavery is something that ought to be against the law.

In the State of Texas they have in our legislature imposed a law that as many read it would not allow teaching the truth about slavery in schools. There are people who don't want their children to be harmed by hearing about the suffering that people in this country had perpetuated upon them for centuries. They don't want their children to know. They want their children to believe that liberty and justice for all has always applied to all of the people in the country, and it hasn't. They want their children to believe that there has always been equal access to opportunity in this country, which is not true. They don't want their children taught the truth, but the truth is going to be told and taught. The truth will be known. Carlyle was right: "No lie can live forever." William Cullen Bryant was right: "Truth, crushed to Earth, shall rise again." Dr. King was right: "The arc of the moral universe is long, but it bends toward justice."

The truth will be told. You can't hide it from your children. They need to know the truth. It is only after the truth is known that we can then reconcile and have an even greater country than we have today.

The process of reconciliation requires atonement, and for this process of reconciliation I have legislation pending to have a department of reconciliation, a department with a secretary of reconciliation with undersecretaries of reconciliation who will have the responsibility to wake up each and every day and deal with the racial wealth gap, deal with the invidious discrimination that took place against persons who came here and built the railroads, persons of Asian ancestry, the invidious discrimination that took place with the Trail of Tears when people were forced to leave their homes, move across the country, and dwell in a foreign place as it related to them, and the invidious discrimination to deal with the Latino population that many years ago had land taken from them.

Yes, we need a department of reconciliation. I have the legislation for such a department.

But notwithstanding that, we still need this legislation to deal with the

atonement of these big financial institutions that have profited from the labor of human beings who were treated as chattel.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I say every word that I have said today because I am the proud descendant of these humble hands that helped build this Capitol, the proud descendant of these humble hands that helped build the roads and bridges, laid the foundation for this country. They were the foundational mothers and fathers of this country. I am proud to be a descendant of the enslaved people who helped make America great. I am proud to say that I think these enslaved people who helped make America great deserve more than being reviled while the people who tried to maintain slavery are revered—the Confederacy—revered by this House of Representatives.

□ 1445

Slavery reviled. The slaves reviled.

Why do I say that the Confederacy was revered or is revered or has been revered by this House?

Because this House of Representatives granted a Congressional Gold Medal to Confederate soldiers. Some things bear repeating. The House of Representatives in this Chamber passed legislation to accord a Congressional Gold Medal to Confederate soldiers. We revere the enslavers and revere the enslaved.

That hasn't changed. This Congress or the next should accord a Congressional Gold Medal to the enslaved people who built this country. If we could do it for the enslavers, then we can do it for the enslaved.

I will have legislation before this House to allow each and every person to go on RECORD as to whether you have the courage and the intestinal fortitude necessary to set the record straight, to do the right thing—no, more importantly—to do the righteous thing: give the people who built this country the same recognition that you gave to the people who would keep them in chains.

My dear brothers and sisters will have an opportunity. We will find out whether you put principle above politics or whether you are going to put the Confederacy above the enslaved. We will find out.

I assure you; the RECORD will be made known. We will know who voted for and who voted against.

Mr. Speaker, as I was saying, we will file this legislation. We will give Members an opportunity to demonstrate where they stand.

Dr. King was right: The truest measure of the person is not where you stand in times of comfort and convenience when all is well in your world. The truest measure of the person is where do you stand in times of great challenge and controversy?

I plan to bring the time of challenge to the floor of the House.

The question is: Where will the Members of this great House stand?

Will Members have the courage to accord a Congressional Gold Medal to the enslaved persons?

Will Members have the courage to pass a resolution asking for a department of reconciliation?

Will Members have the courage to vote for legislation to require these megabanks and mega-insurance companies to atone for their connectivity to the greatest crime committed against humanity?

We will find out because the legislation will be presented.

Mr. Speaker, let me close with this: Notwithstanding all that I have said, I still love my country. I still pledge allegiance to the flag, and I still sing the national anthem. I still support those who choose not to say the pledge of allegiance and refuse to sing the national anthem. But I do it because I believe in the Constitution. I believe in the words liberty and justice for all as extolled in the pledge of allegiance. I believe that we can be a country of the people, by the people, and for all of the people.

I believe these things in spite of the fact that my country hasn't always loved me as much as I love it. I just celebrated my 25th birthday for the third time, and my country hasn't always loved me as much as I love my country.

My country required me to drink from colored water fountains, Mr. Speaker. My country required me to sit in the back of the bus and to sit in the balcony of movies. My country required me to go to back doors and get my food. My country required me to step off the sidewalk when other persons of a different hue passed.

I still love my country. I am standing here today because I love my country, and I want my country to live up to the promise made in the Declaration of Independence and the promise made in the Constitution.

I want America to be America for all Americans, and until that day, I will still love my country, but I will remain a liberated Democrat, unbought, unbossed, and unafraid to speak truth to power and truth about power.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

#### FAREWELL TO CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2021, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLER) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the topic of this Special Order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, reflecting on my time in Congress and in the

Pennsylvania General Assembly makes me think about how blessed I am, and we are as Americans. I thank God for giving me the opportunity to serve the outstanding people of Pennsylvania's 12th Congressional District and Pennsylvania's 85th legislative district.

I am also thankful for all the lessons and people who God placed in my life. At a time when I needed guidance, God placed people before me to give me that guidance and that example, and then He gave me the wisdom to accept that guidance and put it to work.

My dad, at a very young age when I was very young, taught me a work ethic second to none. My grandmother taught me the importance of an education and how to be proper.

Max Bingham, owner of Bingham & Son Lumber in Kreamer, Pennsylvania, taught me business, leadership, and how to be an adult. I can't say enough about my wife and her family. My wife and brother-in-law are here today. I am so blessed to have them in my life. My wife and her family taught me kindness. My mother-in-law is the kindest person I have known. It is not always heard people talking about their mother-in-law so affectionately, but she was very kind. It is often said that behind every successful man there is a surprised mother-in-law. That is a little joke of mine that I say. But my wife's family is truly exceptional, and I am very blessed that I married into that family almost 38 years ago.

The list could go on, but the point is no one accomplishes anything alone. America is the greatest country on Earth. Nowhere else in the world can a poor kid like me go from picking up aluminum cans along the side of the road to owning his own home, running a business, starting a small business of his own, and get elected to the Pennsylvania House of Representatives or the United States Congress.

Growing up, we never were envious. If we wanted something for ourselves, we were taught that we had to work for it. Hard work and education is the way to succeed in America. We knew the American Dream was attainable no matter who you are or what you have.

We never used being poor as an excuse. In fact, my grandmother taught me many things at a very young age. I was about 12, she was about 75, and she sat us down at the table one day. I don't know what my brother and I had done. My brother was 1 year older than I. She said: Boys, people who make excuses are weak.

We never used an excuse. We never let anyone, or our government define us. In today's world, if we had grown up now, people probably would have tried to define us as at-risk or disadvantaged. No, we were just poor. Because if you believe in God, and you live in the United States of America, you are not disadvantaged or at-risk.

I have used the experience growing up and the examples that the many people taught me over my lifetime to shape me into the person and public

servant I am today. It has been the honor of my lifetime to represent the good people of Pennsylvania's 12th Congressional District over the past few years, and I thank them for having the confidence in me to do that job.

Our team worked to hold government accountable, create opportunities for workers and job creators, provide veterans with improved care, expand quality healthcare for rural communities, support our farmers, and bolster the Commonwealth's natural gas industry.

One of the best parts of representing Pennsylvania's 12th Congressional District has been traveling the district and meeting the outstanding, intelligent, and hardworking people who live in our communities. That is where the real work happens and from where the solutions to our problems come. These are the people who make a difference.

As politicians, we all go out, we campaign for office, and we all talk about jobs and jobs and what we are going to do. My friend, Bob Garrett, the president of the Greater Susquehanna Valley Chamber of Commerce, reminded me of this one time. He said: You know, FRED, you can't be pro-jobs and anti-business.

I think that is a lesson that people in the Beltway could learn because the job creators and the workers who work in those jobs are the people who are put on the line every day to work and create the wealth in America.

I can say with confidence that every day our team brought their voice and the values of the people of PA-12 to Washington, D.C.

I am incredibly grateful and honored for the work that we have accomplished. It was made possible by the integrity, passion, and commitment of our entire team.

Mr. Speaker, what an outstanding group of individuals they are. In fact, our district director and chief of staff is here today, and I just want to give a shout-out to Ann Kaufman who is one of the hardest working and intelligent people I know. I thank her for her work. Jon Anzur and Nick Barley are here with me today. They are just great people. I appreciate the passion and the commitment of the entire team. Without their efforts, their contribution, and their service, we would not have been able to serve Pennsylvania's congressional district so well. It would not have been possible.

Though I will not be in Congress next year, I am reminded of a quote from Ronald Reagan. President Reagan said: "There is no limit to what a man can do or where he can go if he doesn't mind who gets the credit."

I see some of my friends. I thank Mr. KELLY so much, and I appreciate him being here, as well as Representative MILLER-MEEKS. I think I saw somebody else over here. Dr. FOXX is here. These are great individuals and public servants, but I would say these are people who have servants' hearts. They are people who have helped me throughout my time in Congress.

To the rest of the people here in the Beltway: America's greatness does not come from buildings and politicians. It comes from her citizens who are guided by our Lord God Almighty.

A personal example I can give to that, I mentioned a gentleman who has meant so much to me in my adult life and has been there to support my family whenever we needed it. His name is Max Bingham. Max took this young kid, employed him, taught him business, and taught him how to behave and the taught him the right things to do. My life is better because of Max.

□ 1500

Max, our community, our Commonwealth, and our Nation are better because of you. You have touched so many lives and have been a great example to so many people.

Take that example of Max Bingham, and there are many other people that do that. As I mentioned, it doesn't come from inside these walls. It comes from across our great Nation, and we need to make sure that we honor and respect those people for whom we work.

While our Nation still faces many challenges, I am more confident than ever that we will be successful if we continue to believe in the greatness of the American people.

Get government out of the way, protect our God-given freedoms, and allow Americans to keep more of their hard-earned money. In fact, they have earned it.

I am often asked what I plan to do next. The answer is, I do not know. Whatever the good Lord has in store for me next, I will build upon the work our team has accomplished to ensure America remains that shining city on a hill that forebearers saw from afar.

It looks like we have some other people.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY), my colleague.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, Fred and I met several years ago. A mutual friend of ours by the name of Tom Marino had been elected and then decided to leave the Congress. We were really fortunate because the person who came in after Tom was Fred.

We formed kind of an instant friendship. I think a lot of it is because of who raised us, because we oftentimes talk about family.

I was looking at different things that people have said over the ages. This is Thomas Aquinas, over seven centuries ago, who summed up what Western civilization understood to be the natural debt of gratitude all human beings owe to God, family, and country.

Isn't that the truth for all of us? Who is it that we owe this incredible life we have? Those who came before us.

We talked today, as we talk often. Mr. Speaker, 1½ million men and women gave their lives. It wasn't so much that they gave time; they gave

their lives in order for us to practice this incredible form of government, this representative Republic.

People often get confused and talk about our democracy, our democracy, our democracy. We are truly a Republic, and every voice gets heard, every voice gets counted, and every person gets counted.

I think, for my friend and I, we spend a lot of time together. When I look up in the gallery, his family is here.

Where is Camrie? Camrie, stand up, honey. You are so little, I can't see you from down here. There she is.

She is my favorite source of energy. I have never seen a child with the energy she has. But you realize, she is just an offshoot of her grandma and grandpa.

Listen, we have had great fun together, but I think more than anything else, when you come to Washington, if you have never been here before, and you have not served the public before, one of the things when you come to Washington that you are told right away is, if you want a friend in Washington, get a dog.

Well, for me, it wasn't getting a dog. It was getting a chance to serve with FRED KELLER. We do a lot of things together, mostly talk about family and faith and the opportunity we have to serve the people who sent us.

It is never about me; it is always about we. It is never about us; it is always about our families. It is about our wives. It is about our children. It is about our parents and grandparents and aunts and uncles.

You talk about your former employer so well that I feel I know Max. Although we have never met or shook hands, just from the way you have talked about him, I feel I know who he is, and I know how important he was in the whole being of FRED KELLER.

This is truly one of the most unselfish men I have ever known. He doesn't come here for himself. He comes here for his family. He comes here for the people he represents.

He comes here for those 1½ million men and women who have given their lives to give us the opportunity to practice this incredible form of government.

I know sometimes we get mixed up about what this is all about when we sit here and say this is the people's House, with the emphasis on the people. It is not FRED KELLER's House. It is not MIKE KELLY's House. It is not VIRGINIA FOXX's. It is not Dr. MARIANNETTE MILLER-MEEKS'. It is about the people we represent, and each of us represents about three-quarters of a million people.

I know that every week when we have the chance to come here and share time together and share the opportunity to actually bring about legislation, as do you, Mr. Speaker, we need to take a breather sometimes and forget about all the hyperbole and think about all the blessings we have because there is truly no place else in the world

like this. There never has been, but it is up to us to make sure it is available for that next generation.

When I look up in the gallery, and I see Camrie up there, Fred doesn't come here for Fred. Fred comes here for Camrie and for Karsen and for all the other people he represents back in Pennsylvania.

I think that is the beauty of us, who are so fortunate and so honored to serve, because it is not about us. It is about our constituents. It is about all those who came before us.

I have to tell you, buddy. I hate to see you leave because we have had a lot of fun together. We shared a lot of meals. We shared a lot of stories.

You are great at entertaining my staff. They get bored with me from time to time. They always say, boy, I hope Mr. KELLER stops by today.

We have formed an incredible friendship. I have gotten to know Fred. I have gotten to know his wife and his family. He is truly one of the finest Americans you could ever be around.

It has been a wonderful time. It has been a wonderful life, not to coin any famous movies that are a favorite, but I have to tell you that it has been a great time, buddy.

The service you have given to God, to your family, and to your country is immeasurable. We are going to miss you being here, but I know this is not the end of the FRED KELLER story.

I am a phone call away, brother. Any time you need me, I am a phone call away. It has been a pleasure serving with you.

You have some fan favorites here with you that I think we should hear from.

One of my all-time favorite people is VIRGINIA FOXX, who is sitting beside me. Dr. Foxx is one of a kind, and you know from serving on her committee just how special she is.

Mr. KELLER. Thank you, MIKE, for your comments. Love you, pal.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Love you, too, buddy.

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, I have to say, about Dr. Foxx, I remember when I first got here, and they were working out committees because I came in in a special election. I had to promise not to create any trouble for Dr. Foxx, I think is what it was. But I think what it really meant was you better work hard. I think that is what it meant. You better contribute. You better work hard.

There isn't anybody who runs a better ship when it comes to making sure that we accomplish the goals on behalf of the people we represent than a great mentor, a great person who has become a friend over the past few years, Dr. VIRGINIA FOXX.

Ms. FOXX. As we say here sometimes to save time, I certainly associate myself with the very eloquent words of Congressman KELLY. He is so good. You see that he needed no notes. He can just come up here and speak without anything.

This is a tough day for me to come in and talk about your leaving, Congressman KELLER, but we want to let you know how much we appreciate you. That is why we are here.

One thing I have learned about Representative FRED KELLER while serving with him in Congress is that he is someone who always shows up prepared to work on behalf of job creators and workers, and he is committed to upholding the Constitution.

I am so glad your staff and family are there in the gallery with us today because I know they have heard positive things about you before, but I think it is helpful for them to hear us come here today in this special place to say these things to you.

I have greatly appreciated and admired FRED's strong commitment to conservative principles. As a businessman and job creator himself, he knows the free market works and is dedicated to protecting it.

It is clear why FRED recently received the Guardian of Small Business Award from the National Federation of Independent Business.

His stalwart defense of limited government and fiscal responsibility will serve as an example to current and future lawmakers alike.

FRED has been an important leader on the Education and Labor Committee. As the Republican leader on the Subcommittee on Workforce Protections, FRED worked hard to protect the rights of workers and job creators.

He was well suited for this function because he has real-world experience in business. Managing a plant of 250 people for 25 years gave FRED the experience needed to serve our country's workforce. The committee and this Congress have benefited from his insight and wisdom.

I have also admired FRED's commitment to the sanctity of life, which has been second to none in this body. I will never forget the story FRED told during a hearing that none of us had ever heard before and were not expecting to hear.

The story was about his son, Freddie, who suffered a traumatic brain injury at a young age. Doctors told FRED and his wife that there was zero chance his son would recover. Despite pressure from doctors, FRED and his wife refused to take their son off life support. Freddie recovered and is now in his thirties, working for the healthcare industry. What a victory for parents' love for their son and the principle of life.

FRED's commitment to life didn't end back in his son's hospital room. It is something he has been dedicated to throughout his life.

No matter where he goes, FRED wears a pin on his collar that represents the exact size and shape of baby's feet at 10 weeks after conception. It is a daily reminder that life is sacred, and it is our duty to protect the most vulnerable.

It is no surprise that FRED received an A-plus rating on the Susan B. Anthony List National Pro-Life Scorecard.

As he said on the House floor: If my time in Congress is to be remembered for one thing, let it be that I fought to defend the sanctity of life.

You have certainly done that, FRED. Congressman KELLER, we will remember. We will remember that you stood against the Democrats' radical pro-abortion agenda. We will remember that you stood up for the conscience, rights, and religious freedoms of healthcare workers. We will remember that you gave a voice to the 63 million unborn babies killed in the womb before they had voices.

Today, when our first freedoms are called into question, we need leaders who will take a stand without wavering and defend our constitutional rights. That is exactly what FRED did when he introduced the Restoring Academic Freedom on Campus Act. Defending the freedom of expression on college campuses is imperative, and I appreciate FRED's work on this issue.

The freedom to speak and think freely comes from God. Students should not have to sign away their First Amendment rights after enrolling in college, especially if those institutions accept taxpayer funds. It is time for colleges and universities to be held accountable when they refuse to protect the free speech of students and faculty.

I also greatly appreciate how FRED led the Congressional Review Act resolution against OSHA's tyrannical vaccine mandate. FRED used every legislative avenue to help nullify President Biden's emergency temporary standard that would have forced millions of workers to get the COVID-19 vaccine or face losing their jobs.

His commitment to protecting the individual liberties of every American stands out. When OSHA finally withdrew this authoritarian measure after losing at the Supreme Court, FRED and I celebrated.

This is a lesson to us all. Even when the hill is steep, we must fight on. In this case, standing up for the Constitution saved so many Americans from being coerced into making a medical decision they were uncomfortable with. We need leaders who have the courage of their convictions. FRED is such a leader.

Being a leader means having the prudence also to know which hills to fight on, which hills to abandon, and which hills are worth dying for. I believe FRED and I agree that the preservation of our God-given rights is worth any and every sacrifice, and that is why it has been an honor to serve alongside him.

Common cause always creates uncommon bonds, and I will miss you as a partner.

Lastly, FRED has something that far too many of our national leaders lack: humility. FRED has always cared more about service than the spotlight.

Saying FRED will be missed is an understatement. He is what every statesman should be: prudent, decisive, and gracious.

Congressman KELLER, we wish you the best in your future endeavors, knowing that whatever you do next will be in further service to the American people.

From a grateful country and from someone who is honored to call herself your friend, thank you for all you have done to protect freedom and constitutional government. You will be missed.

□ 1515

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, I thank Dr. FOXX. I certainly wasn't anticipating my friends being here today, but I do want to say to Dr. FOXX that she is a great example, and, of course, we have Representative MILLER-MEEKS here.

But I would like to say to Dr. FOXX, if I can, as I told my friend, Max Bingham, when I decided not to run again, I said, Max, I don't have to be elected to serve. Think of all the people we represent that make a difference every day.

When they take a kid like me and invest time and resources in them, that is what the people across America do. That is what you do, that is what MIKE KELLY does, that is what Representative MILLER-MEEKS does. I will stay in touch with all my friends that are here to make a difference. I thank them all for that.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Iowa (Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS).

Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I don't know if I am going to make it through this without a tear either, Dr. FOXX.

Mr. Speaker, I have had the privilege of spending the last 2 years across the hallway in the Longworth Building from our colleague, FRED KELLER. Throughout that time, I have been lucky enough to get to know FRED and his staff, and each was eager to lend a hand as my own staff and I adjusted to our new office, which was a little bit of a challenge because we had a contest and so we were a little late adding staff.

I think one of the easiest ways to judge a Member of Congress is by their staff and the team they assemble. Team Keller has always been helpful, insightful, talented, intelligent, kind, and thoughtful.

I also got to know FRED and his wife when we met for a longer period of time last summer at Nemaquin in Pennsylvania, his home State. He and his wife and my chief of staff enjoyed getting to know one another. I got to know FRED as a family man, who was elected in a special election, as a surprise to his wife when he let her know that he was going to run for Congress.

I got to know he and his family, and especially his family members that he would bring up to the Capitol, his granddaughters who can be found running up on the seventh floor or here in the Chamber.

When I asked his staff about FRED, one of the things they said struck me

because it is also the reason that I ran for Congress. FRED wanted to make the American Dream accessible to everyone regardless of their background, their social status, their upbringing, their class, their race, or where they come from.

To do so, he spent his days bringing Pennsylvania to Washington and taking Washington back home. He believed, rightfully so, that D.C. could benefit from more hard work and fewer frills.

Now, I don't want you to think that FRED is only a serious person because that would underestimate another part of his personality. I also enjoyed spending time with FRED at the Education and Labor Committee, and being in the minority is no fun.

Once I caught FRED—more than once—thinking out loud and speaking under his breath. And because I sat next to him, when we were permitted to do so after the COVID requirements were lifted, I thought he raised some very salient, erudite points.

As the next Republican to speak, I added them to my own 5-minute speech. After I finished speaking, FRED turned to me, and said: You raised some really good points. I laughed, and said: I certainly hope so, they were the points that you made, and I stole them. He had no idea that he speaks out loud and under his breath, and that I would listen to him and hear him, but that was FRED.

He was and is full of great ideas. We were so very fortunate to have him as a colleague, and I was tremendously saddened the day he announced he would not run for reelection, and that I would miss him as a colleague and as a friend.

I really look forward to what is next for FRED because he will always be in service, he will always succeed, and he will always be a leader because what makes a leader isn't their title, it is not their position, it is not the pin they wear on their lapel.

What makes a leader is an individual, who, by their example, inspires and motivates others, who challenges others to go beyond what they think is their capacity, and reach heights that they did not know they could even reach. FRED does that for his children, for his grandchildren, and for all of us.

I have a feeling this isn't the last that we will see of FRED, and I look forward to future encounters with he and his family. I thank FRED so much for gracing me with all of his intellect, his ideas, his quiet comments under his breath, his salient points, and getting to know his family.

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, I thank Dr. MILLER-MEEKS for that, she is truly an outstanding individual, a veteran, one of the people that stood on the line to defend our freedom and our way of life. That is why we are here, so many fought, and so many cared about the idea that is America. There are so many people that will continue to do that, and for that I tell them thank you for your service.



Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT), my friend and my granddaughter's friend's dad. When you have grandkids, you sort of lose your title.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, you got to admit, a lot of people love Representative KELLER. It has been fun, actually, watching them come up to the microphone and say actually sweet things about him. But the best thing is his granddaughter, my little girl just loves playing with her.

That is something I do hope this body does more of in the future—our kids. In the last couple of years they haven't been here. Before the pandemic, we would look out and people would have their families here. I will tell you, that helped in the relationships.

My little girl would go and jump on MAXINE WATERS' lap because she loved her necklace. I still have a great picture of that. Until this day, every time I see Ms. WATERS she asks about my little girl. In some ways, it is those family units and how you build human relations in this body.

Just a thought for what is left of the majority and those things. We need to sort of think about the things that bind us together once again as people.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate Mr. KELLER giving me a little bit of time here.

Mr. Speaker, one of the reasons we are doing this is we have been trying to do a series of presentations, and I keep being fussed at that I should do them shorter because we are trying to throw out lots of ideas.

For the last year, I have been coming behind the microphone and walking through just how terrified I am, and how terrified I believe all of us should be, on what is going on in the numbers. We are going to do the routine again. The beauty here is there is hope, and I am going to keep bringing ideas that do a couple things.

Number one: Make us freer, healthier, wealthier, but also show a path that we can grow, and we don't have to be crushed by the coming debt. Let's sort of walk through some of this.

We always start with this slide because this one really bothers everyone. This one makes everyone angry and it is the math. Today, we have \$31 trillion of debt. In the next 30 years we add \$114 trillion of borrowing. Every dime of that \$114 trillion that is coming, 75 percent of it is Medicare, 25 percent is Social Security. The rest of the budget actually has a positive balance.

We got old.

Is the graying of America Republican or Democrat?

It is neither. It is just demographics; it is what we are. The unwillingness to deal with the reality that if you want to save the country—if you do not want my 5-month-old little boy that we are adopting, my 7-year-old little girl that plays together with others, if you want to save their future—do understand, today, 25 years from now we have to

double their tax rates; we have to double your tax rates; we have to double corporations' tax rates just to maintain the baseline spending, and that is still with us going to like 140 percent of debt to GDP.

Do we understand how bad the numbers are?

It is demographics. So what do you do?

I am trying to pitch sort of a unified theory for us to think about. I am sorry this upsets people, but the math will always win. Instead of the craziness that goes on around here with where "I got my feelings hurt," maybe the most powerful thing we can do is demonstrate we give a damn.

Growth is moral. Growth helps Democrats and Republicans, it helps poor people, it gives opportunity to the middle class. It is good for all of us. We are trying to say, okay, I have been spending lots of time behind the microphone talking about technology that can crash the price of healthcare. We are going to do a little more of that today.

But I am going to also talk about other ways we can do regulation that keeps us still healthy and safe but is much less bureaucratic and much faster. I am going to come back in the next couple weeks, if we get time, and talk about revolutionizing the tax system that incentivizes us to make things in America instead of functionally a tax system that incentivizes us to buy things made in other parts of the world because that is what we have today.

We are going to also talk about immigration—it is really uncomfortable to talk about, you are going to have to decide as a society: Do we keep the open borders that I have in Arizona where we functionally have a mass poverty movement into the United States? Or do we move to a system that maximizes economic growth?

You have got to decide, if you want us to have the money to be able to pay for Medicare, I have to have the economic growth.

Then the other thing is, what do we do to incentivize our brothers and sisters to stay in the labor market?

You just became 65. Are there things that we could do in a spiff on your Social Security, so you stay in the labor market?

How about if we let you keep your half of the FICA? What can we do?

There is a crazy piece of math out there for under 35, particularly males—they are not participating—there are numbers of them who have disappeared from the labor markets. This makes some of the math really difficult if you are trying to grow because it is not enough to have the disruption in the cost of the healthcare, if on the same side over here we don't have the economic growth.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to run through these fairly quickly because I want to keep the theme going. I am going to be dogged about this because we are going to save this country. We

need to think a little bit differently because right now we are still having the same debates that we were having in the 1990s on this floor.

Last night, I mentioned this. Tonight, I thought I would bring the board with me. What would happen if I came to you tomorrow, and said: Hey, there is this thing that looks like a kazoo, and you blow in it and it almost instantly tells you you have a virus. It instantly bounces off your medical records. It instantly could order your antiviral. Oh, and by the way, the newest versions look like they can detect about 25 different dead cancer proteins.

Wouldn't that be really good for our constituents? Wouldn't that be—the ability for that hardworking family, that working mom, to not try to find a way to take the day off from work, to be able to organize the kids, to find out if she can go into an urgent care center, but functionally have a breath biopsy in her medicine cabinet?

I will argue that it is both moral, it is faster, it is healthier, and it crashes the price of healthcare. This body keeps that type of technology illegal. It is something that would save so much time for the working people in this country, and we keep it illegal because this place is so much like a protection racket. It is not utopian, there are a dozen different versions, and it exists. Much of it has already made it through the FDA. Our problem is we don't reimburse it and we don't make it legal so it can write the script.

If you don't reduce the cost, you can't do marginal—I have some people come in here and say, well, we have an idea. We can remove 2 or 3 percent out of healthcare costs if we do this. We had 16 percent healthcare inflation in many of our markets so far this year. Great, we can find a 1 or 2 percent rounding error.

Do you understand how much trouble we are in?

Your government functionally is an insurance company with an army. It is going to be an insurance company where the insurance side is going to start consuming every dollar and the army is going to have to get smaller. It is demographics. It is the reality where we are.

□ 1530

Why wouldn't this body take an experiment and say let's make it legal. If you can find insurance, if the manufacturer can find insurance for it, FDA approves it, why wouldn't we let this write a script? There are dozens and dozens and dozens of these things.

For those of that walk around with these smartwatches or your fancy supercomputer in your pocket, the fact of the matter is, we should be using every piece of technology to crash the price of healthcare.

Last night, I came and showed some slides about a path, and who knows, maybe it doesn't work. But there might be a path for a cure for diabetes. Diabetes is 33 percent of all healthcare

spending. It is 31 percent of all Medicare spending. It may be the leading contributor to income inequality.

You go, huh? Look at the data. Look at my data sets of who is suffering, who is going blind, who is having their feet cut off.

I represent a tribal community with the second highest per capita diabetes in the world. Is it moral not for us to go and throw every smart idea and sometimes the resources we need to cure it?

Wouldn't that be more moral than this crazy ass argument of, hey, let's go build more clinics so we can help people manage their misery, because that is what we do here. We are better than this. Well, no, we are not better than this, but we could be.

So let's go a little further down the crazy line of, what do you do to grow the economy? So think about what we did last week. We are going to stop this strike because we are going to fight for the way we move goods out of the port and put them on trucks and then put them on a rail car and move it over here.

Yes, we have all the environmental issues of, yes, it is really dirty, it is really filthy. Oh, but the Democrats in their inflation reduction—crazy name for what the bill actually did—bill, made it so if they are going to take the green money, they can't actually do certain innovation; they can't automate because they have to protect all their longshoremen union folks because that is who writes them checks.

So in one hand, we give great lip service; we have got to fix the supply chain; we have got to get greener in the economy. And then they make it illegal. It is in your legislation. You did it.

Yet, at the same time, we have brilliant innovators—and these things aren't Republican, they are just the next generation of innovation—of autonomous rail platforms. You take the container off; you put it on the platform. You hit the button and you say, go to the spur over here and dump this at the warehouse. Go take this and put at the manufacturing facility.

It is electric. The environmental load is dramatically cleaner. It would be a revolution of efficiency.

We keep saying, well, we have got to fix the supply chain. Well, damn it, you made parts of fixing the supply chain illegal.

Why does this place act like a barrier, a protection barrier of allowing innovation in the economy?

We do this over and over and over. Most of the Members don't know it is happening. But we have functionally made that disruption that grows the economy, that if we don't have that growth, we are absolutely—we are in real trouble. Go ahead.

Mr. KELLER. Can I just say you inspired me to think of something. This is the only place that does less with more; the only place that does it. I am sorry. You are talking about this effi-

ciency and stuff, and I just look at this place.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. We make it illegal.

Mr. KELLER. And during COVID they talked about essential jobs.

Well, I tell you what: This is probably the only place on Earth where there are some jobs that are not essential.

But anyhow, sorry for taking your time, sir, but it just reminded me that this is the only place on the face of the Earth that does less with more.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. How many times—and you have some of this in your district—will we get the lobbyists and the folks come in—and this has been going on for 30 years, so this is sort of one of the running joke scams around here.

We need money for rural broadband. We do. I have—well, communities in Arizona—I don't represent them—they have been waiting 20 years for that line to get out to the chapter house on the Navajo reservation.

The fact of the matter is every inch of this country actually has broadband right now. They just happen to be satellites. We have what, five companies? A couple of them already have most of the satellites up.

Mr. KELLER. Actually, I have an F-150 that I can run seven devices from anywhere in PA-12.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. What is yours? I drive a long-bed pickup truck.

Mr. KELLER. 2022.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. When I had my midlife crisis, I didn't want a new wife or a Porsche, I just wanted a long-bed pickup truck; and mine is 10 years old.

Mr. KELLER. I got the F-150 so I didn't have to buy a generator because it has one in it. So that was my justification for that.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. But you think about this; if I really cared about that community—and you see where this ties in, this is back to that unified theory. I believe much of my healthcare I can use technology, but I need access to the broadband. But I am going to wait for the wire to show up because that is incredibly inefficient.

But I do have an option right now where something like the Starlink satellites, I could actually put up a little oval-shaped dish so they have the broadband, so they can use the healthcare technology, let alone the education technology and the other things. I need you to see this as a unified theory.

But, instead, we are going to take that tax that is on your cell phone bill, hand it out to companies, and then we are going to wait another decade for that wire to get out; and it never gets there, when they already have access to broadband.

This could be urban, too. The technologies exist. So let me go to crazy town.

Mr. KELLER. You are already here.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. No, no, no. This is one, it is a little more ethereal, but

it is in the field. It is being tested right now. I am not going to do the whole thing about a C4 plant and a C3 plant. Remember your high school biology class.

But what would happen in a world—I am sorry, this slide is a little old, so it is a little beaten on. How do you get the Agriculture Committee to have an honest conversation saying, you do realize there is about to be a revolution in food?

This whole thing called synthetic biology: They basically figured out how to take a plant—our high school biology plant—the plant really, really wants a carbon molecule so it turns it into a sugar so it can grow. It accidentally grabs an oxygen. It doesn't need the oxygen, so it has to spend all this energy getting rid of the oxygen so it gets a carbon so it can grow.

What happens if the plant every time got a carbon molecule?

In some plants you could have a 40 percent improvement in growth; dramatically less water; dramatically less land needed; dramatically less fertilizer. This is being tested right now, I think it is University of Illinois. It is out there.

How much discussion have we had that there is a revolution coming in agriculture? And it would be incredibly productive. It would be incredibly disruptive because, what happens in agriculture land if, all of a sudden, I have crops that grow dramatically more efficiently?

But it would also be amazing for the environment. At 40 percent production improvement—which you are not going to get, but if you did, theoretically—in world agriculture, you do realize that would be like removing every car off the face of the Earth.

How many hearings have we had on is this coming, is this feasible?

No, because that would require thinking, something we just don't do here.

The other thing I am going to give you is just a conceptual idea, and if anyone is crazy enough, go on YouTube, Schweikert Environmental Crowdsourcing.

Five, 6 years ago, I did a little YouTube cartoon. It is like 90 seconds, with this concept, you could actually attach a little environmental sensor to the bottom of this.

How about if in your community you had a couple of thousand people driving around with a little environmental sensor saying, hey, we are keeping an eye on the air quality. Hey, it is spouting off. I have some clowns over here painting cars in the back of their house, but the motorcycle paint shop over here that has its filters, it is not setting the alarm off. Leave them alone.

What would happen if your environmental data was living data?

You wouldn't need people to go fill out paperwork. You don't need an inspector. Do file cabinets full of paper make the environment cleaner? They don't, they just build bureaucracy.

What makes the environment cleaner is knowing when someone has done something stupid and stopping them.

Crowdsourcing. The data is living. Use a living data model. And guess what? You can do that for water, for sound; you can actually do it for health. You can do it for all sorts of things.

How many hearings has this place had to discuss dragging our regulatory environment; and it is not deregulating, it is smart regulating. Make us more efficient.

It turns out, the data says that we would be healthier, cleaner, faster, and you would get the bad guys, and you could build a model where you just leave the good actors alone.

If you are the motorcycle paint shop, and your filters are working, and your booth is working, why should you be bothered? Just leave them alone; and if they screw up, a crowdsourced environmental sensor model will catch them instantly.

You would be amazed the pushback you get because, well, we are a consulting firm. You just put us out of business. Hey, I work for the group. I shove paperwork in the file cabinets. Why do you want to unemploy me?

We are going to have to have the discussion if we intend to survive, where we are going population-wise, debt-wise.

Remember, functionally, in 10 years, we have two \$1 trillion running deficits, and it is demographics. It is trying to pay for healthcare. We have got to have the growth, and we have got to have the technology disruption and healthcare, or we are in for some very dark times.

The fact of the matter is, we could have incredibly prosperous times for the future. But that prosperity is only going to come if I, and you, and the people who are willing to listen to this are willing to pound on Members of Congress and our staff and the lobbying communities and our creative thinkers out there and say, okay, guys. There is hope out there. There is hope. We just need to be willing to think differently and embrace the disruption and embrace an economy that actually starts to do good things for our people, instead of basically being a protection racket for incumbent models.

It is uncomfortable, but there is hope. But there is no hope if we keep doing the same thing.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Pennsylvania for letting me do this. We are finding the only way it is going to sink in is if I keep coming and giving more and more examples that there is hope if we just do things differently. So I thank the gentleman for giving me some of his time.

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Arizona for his insight. I have nobody else to speak in this hour, so I yield back the balance of my time.

#### ISSUES OF THE DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2021, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROY) for 30 minutes.

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my friend from Arizona being down here, as always, enlightening the American people and using the floor time in the honor of our soon-to-be-leaving-the-House friend, LOUIE GOHMERT, and making sure that we use the time here to inform our constituents back home.

As usual, the American people understand I am speaking to a mostly empty Chamber, with the exception of the Speaker and my friends who are now leaving who were just here. This is pretty much what we get in terms of debate here in the House Chamber.

Earlier today we had a little bit of back and forth on a couple of bills, but they are pre-programmed, like 30 minutes a side, pre-designed, all designed to get right off the floor; and I want to talk about that. That is why I am coming down here today.

Today, we took up two bills on the floor of the people's House. We took up a bill that is ostensibly focused on marriage and allowing recognition of same-sex marriages from one State to another.

But in that bill is something that is pretty significant for the American people to understand, regardless of your views about how the bill is being sold, about it being about recognition of same-sex marriage. Actually, they say it is about codifying Obergefell and same-sex marriage. It does no such thing. It only deals with recognition across State lines.

But even if you think that is good policy, even if you voted for it—and I didn't think it was good policy. I would have voted against it on the merits—in the bill is a sword, a private right of action, a private right of action able to be used and creating the ability of the Attorney General of the United States to go after individuals for actions they carry out, their closely held religious beliefs.

People in this Chamber voted for it, knowing full well that the language in that bill will allow lawyers and organizations to come sue Americans and force them into court; and their response is that, oh, don't worry, you have the Constitution of the United States and the Religious Freedom Restoration Act.

Well, no kidding. I know the Constitution exists. And the Religious Freedom Restoration Act dates back to, I don't know, '93 or '94, sometime in the 1990s.

□ 1545

But now, if you dare, as an organization, a religious school, for example, say: "Wait a minute. It is against our tenets of faith to hire a same-sex couple, or an individual who is part of a same-sex couple, as a teacher in our

school," or maybe another organization makes a choice along those lines, now you are in court.

Now you are having to go defend yourself. Now you are having to go take this up to the Fifth Circuit and up to the United States Supreme Court, trying to figure out how they are going to interpret all of this, whether this law is even constitutional in the first place, all because our colleagues on the other side of the aisle wanted not to just provide for recognition across States—again, a proposition with which I do not agree. But not just that. They wanted to make sure that there was a sword to go after you if you disagree.

Earlier this summer, a member of Parliament in Finland was prosecuted for a pamphlet she distributed 20 years ago in defense of traditional marriage and in opposition to same-sex marriage.

Again, whatever your views are on the issue, let me be perfectly clear: What is happening today, what was decided today on the floor of the House, and all those Members on that side of the aisle and the 39 on this side of the aisle who voted for that legislation, voted for a sword to go after individual Americans, private citizens, and private organizations for daring to carry out their closely held, private religious beliefs.

We will be back here talking about that. We will be back here trying to pass legislation to make sure we can protect them.

I offered an amendment in the Committee on Rules to try to get a vote on the floor of the House, and I was denied even the ability to offer the amendment. We couldn't even offer the amendment. Lord knows, I don't have the power to offer an amendment on the floor of the House of Representatives.

Again, I want everybody out there in America to understand that not since May 2016 has an individual of the so-called people's House been able to walk into the well of the House and offer an amendment on a piece of legislation, this time as consequential as marriage and religious liberty.

Again, let me reiterate, whatever your views are on the issue—and I have mine—shouldn't we be able to debate marriage? Shouldn't we be able to debate religious liberty and the ability to protect your views and your closely held religious beliefs?

No, no, no. I was punted out of the Committee on Rules for supposedly, irony of ironies, on a day in which we just authorized \$860 billion in a 4,400-page bill I got 40 hours before I voted on it, because it would score over half a million dollars—yeah, \$500,000—over 10 years.

That wasn't even actually what the CBO said. They said it could because it might create some revenues and some expenditures and, those expenditures, those outlays, would be what? Damages if you went to court and you succeeded.

I want you to be able to understand that my Democratic colleagues used a point of order to shut down an amendment to protect religious liberty if it would be successful to protect your rights. That is assuredly and 100 percent what happened, yet it was just blown over, disregarded here in the House Chamber, including by 39 members of my own party, because that is the way this town works.

The bill was dubbed a gay marriage codification of Obergefell bill. You had 39 members of my party go: Oh, well, I have to be for that because we have to be for our Libertarian-type principles. Never mind that you are trampling on the ability of States and communities to be able to decide how they want to live, how they want to set up their communities, trampling on millennia, thousands of years, of traditional marriage, which is designed very specifically for families and children. There is tons of evidence and research on this.

But, no. We have to do that. We have to ignore the sword and the attack on religious liberty. It was voted on today without debate and without an amendment. It is extraordinary.

What else did we do today in this august body, so much debate and interaction and discussion among the 435 Members here on the floor? What else was done today? I will tell you what was done today. On the desk on the floor of the House of Representatives was a stack of papers up on the second level, 4,400 pages stacked up right there, which I got at 9 p.m. on Tuesday night.

We have a rule in the House of Representatives that you are not supposed to vote on legislation if you don't have at least 72 hours to read it. Why might you have that rule? I don't know. Color me crazy. Maybe I should read what is in a 4,400-page bill. I know that is a radical position. I know that puts me over in the insane camp. Oh, there is crazy CHIP ranting on the floor of the House because, oh, my God, he wants 72 hours to read a bill.

Whenever I say this, how many people go: You know what is in the bill. What is wrong? How long does it take you to read a bill?

How many Members do you think read all 4,400 pages?

Oh, but, CHIP, they have staff for that. You have all the committee staff. The committee staff does that.

We hold the election certificate. How many of your staff do you think read the 4,400 pages? I know my staff was poring over it late night on Tuesday night and all day yesterday just to see what was in it.

Surprise, surprise. What do you find in it? 4,400 pages, \$860 billion authorized under the National Defense Authorization Act. I had less than 40 hours before I was voting on it, in plain violation of the 72-hour rule, because we waive the rules all the time. We set up rules and waive them. Nobody seems to care. They just go: Oh, my God, I have a steak dinner to go to. I have a Christmas party to go to.

I was down here last night debating the rule on marriage. I was solo. I was one, even on my side of the aisle.

When I finished, the House Chamber closed. We were done. I rolled down the street and went to a Christmas party. There were a lot of Members there. There were a lot of Members all over this town rolling out down to their Christmas parties. They sure as hell weren't here debating marriage and religious liberty.

What do we get in getting this NDAA passed? We got a vaccine mandate repeal. Or did we? I think we got a really important step forward to say that the members of the military shouldn't be fired if they dare question whether they must take a needle in their arm for a vaccine that has not been proven to be actually effective in halting transmission and certainly not necessary for those who are young and healthy, by virtually any account by any doctor that we have had testify on this. So you reject the needle and you get fired from the United States military.

For 2 years, we have been calling to get rid of the vaccine mandates. Finally, in December 2022, right on the way out, Democrats say: Whoa, okay, in order to get this 4,400-page monstrosity across the finish line, we will accept that we will, in 30 days, undo the memo at the Department of Defense.

That memo could be reissued. In fact, the Democrat chair of the Committee on Armed Services effectively said that.

Are we going to get anybody reinstated? Are we going to get everybody honorably discharged? Are we going to be able to say maybe you shouldn't be harassed? Because that is what happens.

You didn't take a needle; you are not getting that job. You didn't take a needle; you are not necessarily getting that promotion. Retaliation, again, for a vaccine that doctors and the CDC today acknowledge does nothing for transmission, that is unnecessary for people who are healthy and young.

Here we are. We passed an NDAA in order to get—oh, man we finally got that vaccine mandate repeal language.

Look, I am glad to get it. We have been fighting for it. We didn't get half a loaf. We got the crumbs of one piece of bread. But it was so important so we could stop the next person from getting fired. We sure as hell didn't help the guy who got fired last week.

It is \$860 billion, \$45 billion above the President's request, 9 percent over 2022 levels.

I am for more money for lethality. I am for more money for a Department of Defense fully capable of killing people and blowing stuff up because that is what you want your Department of Defense to be capable of doing when called upon to do it. I am not for a social engineering experiment wrapped in a uniform. Unfortunately, that is what we are turning the Department of Defense into.

Authorizing a Department of Defense center for excellence in environmental security on how and why environmental stresses to human safety and water and energy will cascade to economic, social, political, or national security events; renewing the DOD's annual environment and energy reports; establishing a joint working group on prioritization for energy systems, which "may reduce conventional air pollution"; creating a pilot program for electric vehicle charging stations; having zero emissions by 2035 for non-tactical vehicles.

Meanwhile, China is just pumping out aircraft carriers and boats, building their military, building coal-fired power plants. We ain't building any coal-fired power plants. We are barely building any gas-fired power plants. They are out building their military, and we are focused on the coral reef, which appeared 286 times in the text of the NDAA.

Well, what else do we do? We establish a commission on reform and modernization of the State Department to offer recommendations to the President and Congress related to personnel-related matters, to strengthen diversity and inclusion, to ensure that the Department's workforce represents all of America.

Well, I am sure China is shuddering. We order the DOD to submit a report on its efforts to increase marketing and advertising to adequately reach racial and minority communities. We require the Coast Guard to implement a recommendation by the RAND Corporation to increase representation of women and racial and ethnic minorities. We require the Coast Guard Commandant to develop a 10-year strategy to enhance diversity.

We talked about the coral reef before. We got the Global Food Security Reauthorization Act. We have a program for projects to combat coastal erosion in Alaska. What we don't have is a repeal of the 2002 Authorization for Use of Military Force. It has been there for 20 years, and we are not even using it.

Why do we leave these in place indefinitely? What do we have in there? A provision that undermines Second Amendment rights, creates a pilot program on the safe storage of personally owned firearms for members of the Armed Forces. It is on a voluntary basis, but here is the problem: It establishes a structure for the DOD to be providing storage devices for members of the military.

We know what the next step is: another grant program, another funding program through the Department of Justice, another program through another agency to be telling you that you must take or you can volunteer to take—you take these but you must put the gun in whatever storage device the government gives you. That is where this is headed.

We all know this. They act like it is minimal, doesn't matter, but that is

what happens. Then we embrace it, and that program never goes away. It just gets bigger. No little pilot programs try something and then get out of the way. When did the government ever start something and not make it bigger?

We are sitting here with \$32 trillion of debt, and all we are doing is talking about how much money we are going to spend.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle say: Why don't you increase taxes? I tell you what, why don't we have that debate? You can't tax enough to spend all the money we are spending. You literally can't. Run the numbers. Put up a spreadsheet. If we ever actually debated and came down here and had a serious conversation, we could have that debate. I would love to have that debate, but we just keep writing checks we can't cash.

□ 1600

What else are we doing? Authorizing and extending security support to Ukraine at \$800 million without inspector general oversight.

Amendments were offered in the Foreign Affairs Committee just the other day, saying: Well, shouldn't we have more oversight with Ukraine money?

Democratic colleagues said: Well, we are for oversight, but not right now. Why in the hell would we want to have oversight right now over the money we are now spending in Ukraine and how it is being used?

No, let's just figure it out later because then what will we do? Nothing. We will do the same thing we always do: Spend more money that we don't have.

Not one Member of this body can come down here and refute that because every Member of this body knows it is true.

I will throw that out there, a challenge. I would love any Member of this body, any of my 434 colleagues, to come on down. Let's debate the proposition that we are going to do anything other than spend more money that we don't have.

I will wait for the takers because the fact is it is true, and it is both sides of the aisle.

Here is what will happen: Next year, Republicans will be in control. Next year, there will be all sorts of debate about appropriations bills. We will go through all the motions. Maybe we will pass some really good appropriations bill that holds spending in check to inflation or frozen at 2022 levels or whatever. Come up with something, anything that any normal budget, family, business would do.

Our guys will come down and do all that, be all proud, pat ourselves on the back, "Oh, yes, look at us. We just passed something that is fiscally responsible." Even if it is not, we will say it is.

Then what? We will barrel forward. The Senate won't accept it. Sometime in August or September, right before a

big government shutdown threat, Senators will say, "We are not taking that."

A whole bunch of people will say, "Oh, no. Defense, they need their appropriations." A whole bunch of people will say, "We need nondefense discretionary."

Hey, I have an idea, why don't we just spend it all? Let's just do that. Let's just say, yes, we will get a 10 percent increase for nondefense discretionary and a 10 percent increase for defense, and we will just call it a day and say, "Well done us." We just spent our children's inheritance so we can go give a speech saying how we helped our military; we wrote a whole bunch more checks for a whole bunch more government bureaucrats and agencies because we have more grants and more programs to promise you more stuff at the United States house of free stuff. We are just going to dole that out without regard to any responsibility whatsoever.

Not one Member of this body can refute what I just said other than the maybe hyperbolic examples, although I don't know that they are that hyperbolic. I will wait and see next September where we are on the numbers.

"Inflation is high. Don't you understand, CHIP? So why don't we just spend at inflation levels?" Oh, good. Let's just increase the entire budget of the United States by 8, 9, 10 percent when we are \$32 trillion in debt and when mandatory spending is on autopilot to continue to blow through the roof.

What about those interest rate payments? Those have gotten a little crazy, huh? Sitting here with now 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 percent interest. We didn't see that one coming, did we? Except that we did, but we didn't care because both sides will retreat to their postures, and then they will just kind of throw their hands up and say: "CHIP, it just is what it is. Biden is President. You need 60 in the Senate. We have a thin majority, so, man, what are we going to do?" And here we sit.

I will give this speech again in January, and I will give it again in March, and I will give it again in May, and then we will be here in September, and I hope someone can prove me wrong, but I will take the bet. There will either be a CR because we can't come to an agreement, which means we are spending at this year's levels, which is I guess somewhat fiscally better, but bad for defense and bad for how you do things, or there will be a massive bunch of spending. That is it. Those are your choices.

There will not be a reasonable sit-down to do the job that we are supposed to do.

I believe I am going to get in trouble, but I need to go do a radio interview, so I am going to have to walk off the floor now.

Here is the thing: I am just asking any one of the Members of either side of the aisle to say we are going to stop

doing that. At some point, we are going to stop doing that, stop spending money we don't have, stop cooking all these bills up in back rooms and dropping them on the floor like happened just today with a 4,400-page, \$860 billion National Defense Authorization Act, airdropped onto the floor, take it or leave it.

So, I left it, and I had to vote against defense, which is not exactly where I want to be, but I am sure as heck not going to continue to go down this road and look at my kids and grandkids one day and say: Well, too bad. Your country is bankrupt.

I hope my colleagues will wake up tomorrow and say they want to avoid having to say the same thing to their kids or grandkids.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

#### ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Cheryl L. Johnson, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly an enrolled bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 8404. An act to repeal the Defense of Marriage Act and ensure respect for State regulation of marriage, and for other purposes.

#### EXPLANATORY STATEMENT ON THE INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2023, SUBMITTED BY MR. SCHIFF, CHAIRMAN OF THE HOUSE PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The following is the Explanatory Statement (the "Explanatory Statement") to accompany the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2023 ("the Act"), which has been included as Division F of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2023. The Explanatory Statement reflects the result of negotiations between the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence and the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence (together, "the Committees"). The Explanatory Statement shall have the same effect with respect to the implementation of the Act as if it were a joint explanatory statement of a conference committee.

The classified nature of U.S. intelligence activities prevents the Committees from publicly disclosing many details concerning their final decisions regarding funding levels and policy direction. Therefore, the Committees have prepared a classified annex—referred to here and within the annex itself as "the Agreement"—that contains a classified Schedule of Authorizations and that describes in detail the scope and intent of the Committees' actions.

The Agreement authorizes the Intelligence Community (IC) to obligate and expend funds as requested in the President's budget and as modified by the classified Schedule of Authorizations, subject to applicable reprogramming procedures.

The classified Schedule of Authorizations is incorporated into the Act pursuant to Section 6102 of the Act. It has the status of law. The Agreement supplements and adds detail to clarify the authorization levels found in the Act and in the classified Schedule of Authorizations.

This Explanatory Statement incorporates by reference, and the Executive Branch shall

comply with, all direction contained in the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence Report to accompany the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2023 (S. Rept. 117-132) and in the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence Report to accompany the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2023 (H. Rept. 117-546). The Agreement supersedes all classified direction related to programs and activities authorized by the Schedule of Authorization.

The Executive Branch is further directed as follows:

#### ENFORCEMENT OF CYBERSECURITY REQUIREMENTS FOR NATIONAL SECURITY SYSTEMS

Section 6309 is intended to codify, for the elements of the IC, the key elements of the "Memorandum on Improving the Cybersecurity of National Security, Department of Defense, and Intelligence Community Systems" issued by the White House on January 19, 2022, also known as NSM-08, and any successor policy guidance. The section also requires agencies (1) to meet the deadlines established under those requirements and (2) to prioritize resources in a manner to fully implement the requirements established by the deadlines.

#### INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY EXPERTS PANEL ON ANOMALOUS HEALTH INCIDENTS

The Committees are committed to protecting and supporting IC and other federal government personnel who have experienced debilitating, unexplained attacks, or anomalous health incidents, while serving their country. The Committees are also focused on transparency in reporting by those agencies whose personnel have been affected by anomalous health incidents.

Therefore, the Committees direct that the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA), as part of the reporting required by Section 6412 of the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2023, submit a plan to implement the recommendations of the IC Experts Panel on Anomalous Health Incidents. The Committees further direct that the Department of State Bureau of Intelligence and Research, as part of the assessment required by Section 6810 of the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2023, submit a plan to implement the recommendations of the IC Experts Panel on Anomalous Health Incidents.

#### STAFFING OF OFFICE SUPPORTING CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY WORKFORCE WELLBEING

Section 6416 of the Act establishes an Office to support the physical, mental, and overall wellbeing of eligible CIA employees and certain other individuals affiliated with the Agency. The Committees recognize the Agency's need for appropriate flexibility and therefore did not legislatively mandate minimum staffing levels for the Office. However, Section 6416 does require the Director of the CIA to assign to the Office "a sufficient number of individuals, who shall have no official duties other than duties related to the Office while so assigned." The Committees fully expect the Agency, consistent with the Agency's plan that was briefed to the Committees, to staff the office with at least 10 full-time individuals. The Committees direct the Agency to promptly notify the Committees if the Office has less than 10 individuals assigned to the Office on a full-time basis.

#### INTELLIGENCE ASSESSMENT OF EFFECTS OF COUNTERTERRORISM STRIKES

The Committees direct the Director of the Defense Intelligence Agency (DIA), in coordination with the directorates of intelligence of the combatant commands, to prepare an intelligence assessment of the effects of counterterrorism strikes conducted by the Armed Forces on targets outside of areas of active hostilities during the 5-year period preceding the date of the enactment of the Act. The assessment shall include:

(1) an analysis of the strike's short- and long-term effects on the capability and intent of the terrorist group to conduct external operations, particularly operations targeting the United States, U.S. persons, or U.S. facilities;

(2) an analysis of the strike's effects on the recruitment of the terrorist group;

(3) an analysis of the strike's effects on local perception of the terrorist group, the host country, and the United States;

(4) an identification of the number and quality of finished intelligence products that assessed the effects that a U.S. counterterrorism strike would have, or did have, against specific terrorist individuals or groups; and

(5) recommendations to improve the efficacy, accuracy, and timeliness of intelligence analysis to increase the strategic effect of counterterrorism strikes.

The Committees further direct the Director of the DIA to submit to the congressional intelligence committees and the congressional defense committees, within 180 days of the enactment of the Act, a report containing both this intelligence assessment and judgments regarding the following questions:

(1) What percentage of counterterrorism strikes covered by the intelligence assessment had a short-term effect on the planned external operations of the terrorist group, particularly operations targeting the United States, U.S. persons, or U.S. facilities?

(2) What percentage of counterterrorism strikes covered by the intelligence assessment had a long-term effect on the planned external operations of the terrorist group, particularly operations targeting the United States, U.S. persons, or U.S. facilities?

The report may be submitted in classified form, except that the judgments shall be in unclassified form. For purposes of this direction, the term "counterterrorism strikes" means an air strike conducted by the U.S. Armed Forces targeting a specific individual that is not a defensive strike conducted to reduce imminent danger to the U.S. Armed Forces or specifically designated partner forces of the United States, and the term "external operations" means violent operations conducted outside the terrorist group's country or region of origin.

#### REPORT ON EFFORTS OF THE FBI TO IDENTIFY AND PROMOTE DIVERSE CANDIDATES

The Committees direct the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, within 90 days of the enactment of the Act, to submit to the congressional intelligence committees and to post on the public website of the Bureau a statistical report on the status of efforts by the Bureau to identify and promote diverse candidates over the past five fiscal years. For Supervisory Special Agent program managers, Field Supervisory Special Agents, Assistant Special Agents in Charge, Special Agents in Charge, and senior executives, the report shall include tables of figures that break down by race and gender the following information:

(1) The total number, and the percentage, of Special Agents who applied for such positions;

(2) The total number, and the percentage, of Special Agents who were interviewed for such positions;

(3) The total number, and the percentage, of Special Agents who were selected for such positions; and

(4) The average number of times a Special Agent applied for such position before selection.

For purposes of this direction, the term "senior executives" means Deputy Assistant Director, Assistant Director, Executive Assistant Director, Associate Deputy Director, and Deputy Director.

The Committees further direct that the report shall include, with respect to GS-14 and GS-15 positions, tables of figures that break down by race and gender the following information:

(1) The total number of individuals in such positions, and the percentage of such individuals, who retired over the past five fiscal years; and

(2) The total number of individuals in such positions, and the percentage of such individuals, who retired early over the past five fiscal years.

#### REPORT ON IMPROVING OPPORTUNITIES FOR WOMEN AND MINORITIES FOR PROMOTIONS IN THE INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY

The Committees direct the Director of National Intelligence, in consultation with the heads of the elements of the IC, to submit to the congressional intelligence committees within 120 days of the enactment of the Act a consolidated report on specific steps taken by each element to enhance opportunities for women and minorities for promotions across all mission categories of the IC, and to reduce the gap among gender, racial, and ethnic categories at senior levels of the IC. The report shall contain a strategic plan from each element of the IC on the following:

(1) Overcoming any barriers or obstacles identified in the report;

(2) Proposing new or enhanced mentoring programs or similar workplace forums to support women and minority officers of the IC who are interested in or may qualify for promotion opportunities or other career advancements;

(3) Recommending additional steps and initiatives to achieve diversity among senior roles in the IC; and

(4) Addressing any gaps in relevant tools, resources, or authorities.

#### BRIEFINGS ON INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES IN CYBERSPACE

The Committees direct the Secretary of Defense, on a quarterly basis, to provide to the congressional intelligence committees and the congressional defense committees a briefing, with respect to the covered period, on the intelligence activities occurring in cyberspace conducted by United States Cyber Command in support of current and future offensive or defensive cyberspace operations.

#### SUBMISSION OF CERTAIN LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS TO THE CONGRESSIONAL INTELLIGENCE COMMITTEES

The Committees direct the Secretary of Defense to submit to the congressional intelligence committees any legislative proposal that (1) is proposed by the Secretary of Defense to Congress, (2) has been approved by the Office of Management and Budget, and (3) involves a grant, expansion, modification, or cessation of authority involving the intelligence, intelligence-related, or tactical intelligence activities of the Department of Defense. The Committees further direct that any such legislative proposals submitted to the congressional intelligence committees be accompanied by a brief explanation of the proposal.

#### OFFICE OF GLOBAL COMPETITION ANALYSIS

The Committees encourage the President to establish an Office of Global Competition Analysis ("the Office") to conduct analysis relevant to United States leadership in science, technology, and innovation sectors critical to national security and economic prosperity relative to other countries, and to support policy development and decision making across the federal government to ensure United States leadership in science, technology, and innovation sectors critical to national security and economic prosperity relative to other countries, particularly



those countries that are strategic competitors of the United States.

The analysis conducted by the Office should cover:

(1) United States policies that enable technological competitiveness relative to those of other countries, particularly with respect to countries that are strategic competitors of the United States;

(2) United States science and technology ecosystem elements, including regional and national research and development capacity, technology innovation, science and engineering education and research workforce relative to those of other countries;

(3) United States technology development, commercialization, and advanced manufacturing ecosystem elements, including supply chain resiliency, scale-up manufacturing testbeds, access to venture capital and financing, technical and entrepreneurial workforce, and production, relative to those of other countries;

(4) United States competitiveness in technology and innovation sectors critical to national security and economic prosperity relative to other countries, including the availability and scalability of United States technology in such sectors abroad;

(5) trends and trajectories, including rate of change in technologies, related to technology and innovation sectors critical to national security and economic prosperity;

(6) threats to United States national security interests as a result of any foreign country's dependence on technologies of strategic competitors of the United States; and

(7) threats to United States interests based on dependencies on foreign technologies critical to national security and economic prosperity.

The priorities of the Office should be established in coordination with the Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy, the Assistant to the President for Economic Policy, the Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs, and such other officials as the President considers appropriate.

In carrying out the activities of the Office, the Committees expect:

(1) the Office will solicit input on technology and economic trends, data, and metrics from relevant private sector stakeholders, including entities involved in financing technology development and commercialization, and engage with academia to inform the analyses;

(2) the Office will acquire, access, use, and handle data or information in a manner consistent with applicable provisions of law and policy, including laws and policies providing for the protection of privacy and civil liberties, and subject to any restrictions required by the source of the information.

(3) the Office will receive access, upon written request, to all information, data, or

reports of any Executive agency that the Office determines necessary to carry out its activities, to include commercially available information that may not be publicly available; and

(4) consistent with applicable law, the heads of departments or agencies within the Executive will detail personnel to the Office in order to assist the Office in its activities.

The Committees direct the President to submit to the appropriate congressional committees, within 180 days of the date of enactment of the Act, a report analyzing the need for the Office, including recommendations regarding the administrative structure of the Office, as well as a detailed spending plan that includes administrative costs.

ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 1 of House Resolution 1230, the House stands adjourned until noon on Monday for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

Thereupon (at 4 o'clock and 5 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, December 12, 2022, at noon for morning-hour debate.

EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for Official Foreign Travel during the first, third, and fourth quarters of 2022, pursuant to Public Law 95–384 are as follows:

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, MARK IOZZI, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 24 AND OCT. 29, 2022

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Ar- rival	Depar- ture		Foreign currency	U.S. dol- lar equiva- lent or U.S. cur- rency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dol- lar equiva- lent or U.S. cur- rency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dol- lar equiva- lent or U.S. cur- rency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dol- lar equiva- lent or U.S. cur- rency <sup>2</sup>
Mark Iozzi .....	10/24	10/26	Mozambique .....	.....	508.00	.....	471.10	.....	.....	.....	979.10
	10/26	10/29	Kenya .....	.....	500.00	.....	3,555.78	.....	.....	.....	4,055.78
Committee total .....	.....	.....	.....	.....	1,008.00	.....	4,026.88	.....	.....	.....	5,034.88

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. NANCY PELOSI, Nov. 15, 2022.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO INDONESIA, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 5 AND OCT. 7, 2022

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Ar- rival	Depar- ture		Foreign currency	U.S. dol- lar equiva- lent or U.S. cur- rency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dol- lar equiva- lent or U.S. cur- rency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dol- lar equiva- lent or U.S. cur- rency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dol- lar equiva- lent or U.S. cur- rency <sup>2</sup>
Hon. Gregory Meeks .....	10/5	10/7	Jakarta, Indonesia .....	.....	507.80	.....	14,035.57	.....	.....	.....	14,543.37
Laura Carey .....	10/5	10/7	Jakarta, Indonesia .....	.....	507.80	.....	9,041.67	.....	.....	.....	9,549.47
Alexandra Davis .....	10/5	10/7	Jakarta, Indonesia .....	.....	202.91	.....	35.00	.....	.....	.....	237.91
Committee total .....	.....	.....	.....	.....	1,218.51	.....	23,112.24	.....	.....	.....	24,330.75

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. NANCY PELOSI, Nov. 11, 2022.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO IRELAND, ARMENIA, AND MOLDOVA, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 15 AND OCT. 20, 2022

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Ar- rival	Depar- ture		Foreign currency	U.S. dol- lar equiva- lent or U.S. cur- rency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dol- lar equiva- lent or U.S. cur- rency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dol- lar equiva- lent or U.S. cur- rency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dol- lar equiva- lent or U.S. cur- rency <sup>2</sup>
Hon. David Price .....	10/15	10/17	Ireland .....	.....	1265.11	.....	( <sup>3</sup> )	.....	.....	.....	1265.11
Hon. Diana DeGette .....	10/15	10/17	Ireland .....	.....	1265.11	.....	( <sup>3</sup> )	.....	.....	.....	1265.11
Hon. Jim Cooper .....	10/15	10/17	Ireland .....	.....	1265.11	.....	( <sup>3</sup> )	.....	.....	.....	1265.11

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO IRELAND, ARMENIA, AND MOLDOVA, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 15 AND OCT. 20, 2022—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Hon. Andy Levin .....	10/15	10/17	Ireland .....	.....	1265.11	.....	( <sup>3</sup> )	.....	.....	.....	1265.11
Courtney Fry .....	10/15	10/17	Ireland .....	.....	539.82	.....	( <sup>3</sup> )	.....	.....	.....	539.82
Justin Wein .....	10/15	10/17	Ireland .....	.....	539.82	.....	( <sup>3</sup> )	.....	.....	.....	539.82
Derek Luyten .....	10/15	10/17	Ireland .....	.....	539.82	.....	( <sup>3</sup> )	.....	.....	.....	539.82
Hon. David Price .....	10/17	10/18	Armenia .....	.....	732.15	.....	( <sup>3</sup> )	.....	.....	.....	732.15
Hon. Diana DeGette .....	10/17	10/18	Armenia .....	.....	732.15	.....	( <sup>3</sup> )	.....	.....	.....	732.15
Hon. Jim Cooper .....	10/17	10/18	Armenia .....	.....	732.14	.....	( <sup>3</sup> )	.....	.....	.....	732.14
Hon. Andy Levin .....	10/17	10/18	Armenia .....	.....	732.14	.....	( <sup>3</sup> )	.....	.....	.....	732.14
Courtney Fry .....	10/17	10/18	Armenia .....	.....	732.14	.....	( <sup>3</sup> )	.....	.....	.....	732.14
Justin Wein .....	10/17	10/18	Armenia .....	.....	732.14	.....	( <sup>3</sup> )	.....	.....	.....	732.14
Derek Luyten .....	10/17	10/18	Armenia .....	.....	732.14	.....	( <sup>3</sup> )	.....	.....	.....	732.14
Hon. David Price .....	10/18	10/20	Moldova .....	.....	486.00	.....	( <sup>3</sup> )	.....	.....	.....	486.00
Hon. Diana DeGette .....	10/18	10/20	Moldova .....	.....	486.00	.....	( <sup>3</sup> )	.....	.....	.....	486.00
Hon. Jim Cooper .....	10/18	10/20	Moldova .....	.....	486.00	.....	( <sup>3</sup> )	.....	.....	.....	486.00
Hon. Andy Levin .....	10/18	10/20	Moldova .....	.....	486.00	.....	( <sup>3</sup> )	.....	.....	.....	486.00
Courtney Fry .....	10/18	10/20	Moldova .....	.....	486.00	.....	( <sup>3</sup> )	.....	.....	.....	486.00
Justin Wein .....	10/18	10/20	Moldova .....	.....	486.00	.....	( <sup>3</sup> )	.....	.....	.....	486.00
Derek Luyten .....	10/18	10/20	Moldova .....	.....	486.00	.....	( <sup>3</sup> )	.....	.....	.....	486.00
.....	.....	.....	Moldova .....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	3,402.00
.....	.....	.....	Armenia .....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	5,125.00
.....	.....	.....	Ireland .....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	6,679.90
Committee total .....	.....	.....	.....	.....	15,206.90	.....	.....	.....	7,577.08	.....	22,783.98

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.  
<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.  
<sup>3</sup> Military air transportation.

HON. DAVID E. PRICE, Nov. 16, 2022.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO CROATIA, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 23 AND OCT. 27, 2022

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Hon. Nancy Pelosi .....	10/23	10/25	Croatia .....	.....	392.75	.....	( <sup>3</sup> )	.....	.....	.....	392.75
Hon. Gerry Connolly .....	10/23	10/25	Croatia .....	.....	392.75	.....	( <sup>3</sup> )	.....	.....	.....	392.75
General William Walker .....	10/23	10/25	Croatia .....	.....	392.75	.....	( <sup>3</sup> )	.....	.....	.....	392.75
Kate Knudson .....	10/23	10/25	Croatia .....	.....	392.75	.....	( <sup>3</sup> )	.....	.....	.....	392.75
Terri McCullough .....	10/23	10/25	Croatia .....	.....	392.75	.....	( <sup>3</sup> )	.....	.....	.....	392.75
Wyndee Parker .....	10/23	10/25	Croatia .....	.....	392.75	.....	( <sup>3</sup> )	.....	.....	.....	392.75
Emily Berret .....	10/23	10/25	Croatia .....	.....	392.75	.....	( <sup>3</sup> )	.....	.....	.....	392.75
Kelsey Smith .....	10/20	10/25	Croatia .....	.....	1,178.85	.....	1,595.30	.....	.....	.....	2,774.15
Henry Connelly .....	10/23	10/25	Croatia .....	.....	392.75	.....	( <sup>3</sup> )	.....	.....	.....	392.75
Grayson Kisker .....	10/23	10/25	Croatia .....	.....	392.75	.....	( <sup>3</sup> )	.....	.....	.....	392.75
Collin Davenport .....	10/23	10/25	Croatia .....	.....	392.75	.....	( <sup>3</sup> )	.....	.....	.....	392.75
Committee total .....	.....	.....	.....	.....	5,106.35	.....	1,595.30	.....	.....	.....	6,701.65

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.  
<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.  
<sup>3</sup> Military air transportation.

HON. NANCY PELOSI, Nov. 15, 2022.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 2022

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Hon. Tony Gonzales .....	8/1	8/3	El Salvador .....	.....	432.00	.....	1,327.04	.....	.....	.....	1,759.04
	8/3	8/5	Guatemala .....	.....	595.00	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	595.00
	8/5	8/6	Honduras .....	.....	369.00	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	369.00
Hon. David Price .....	8/15	8/15	Cape Verde .....	.....	177.36	.....	.....	.....	375.08	.....	552.44
	8/16	8/17	Mozambique .....	.....	626.00	.....	.....	.....	573.00	.....	1,199.00
	8/17	8/19	Kenya .....	.....	642.00	.....	.....	.....	185.00	.....	827.00
	8/19	8/21	Rwanda .....	.....	802.00	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	802.00
Hon. David Joyce .....	8/21	8/22	Tunisia .....	.....	214.34	.....	.....	.....	440.83	.....	655.17
	8/15	8/15	Cape Verde .....	.....	177.36	.....	.....	.....	375.08	.....	552.44
	8/16	8/17	Mozambique .....	.....	626.00	.....	.....	.....	573.00	.....	1,199.00
	8/17	8/19	Kenya .....	.....	642.00	.....	.....	.....	185.00	.....	827.00
Hon. Barbara Lee .....	8/19	8/21	Rwanda .....	.....	802.00	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	802.00
	8/21	8/22	Tunisia .....	.....	214.34	.....	.....	.....	440.83	.....	655.17
	8/24	8/24	Germany .....	.....	296.99	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	296.99
	8/24	8/27	Ghana .....	.....	918.00	.....	.....	.....	912.60	.....	1,830.60
Hon. Katherine Clark .....	8/27	8/29	Senegal .....	.....	821.00	.....	.....	.....	192.90	.....	1,013.90
	8/29	8/31	Italy .....	.....	982.00	.....	.....	.....	1,088.16	.....	2,070.16
	8/31	9/1	Ireland .....	.....	158.00	.....	4,882.47	.....	123.00	.....	5,163.47
	8/24	8/24	Germany .....	.....	296.99	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	296.99
Hon. Cheri Bustos .....	8/24	8/27	Ghana .....	.....	918.00	.....	.....	.....	912.60	.....	1,830.60
	8/27	8/29	Senegal .....	.....	821.00	.....	.....	.....	192.90	.....	1,013.90
	8/29	8/31	Italy .....	.....	982.00	.....	.....	.....	1,088.16	.....	2,070.16
	8/31	9/1	Ireland .....	.....	158.00	.....	1,921.27	.....	123.00	.....	2,202.27
Hon. Betty McCollum .....	8/24	8/25	Finland .....	.....	357.00	.....	2,476.66	.....	69.38	.....	2,903.04
	8/25	8/27	Norway .....	.....	581.00	.....	4,665.50	.....	426.06	.....	5,672.56

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 2022—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Ar- rival	Depar- ture		Foreign currency	U.S. dol- lar equiva- lent or U.S. cur- rency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dol- lar equiva- lent or U.S. cur- rency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dol- lar equiva- lent or U.S. cur- rency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dol- lar equiva- lent or U.S. cur- rency
Hon. Steven Palazzo .....	8/28	9/1	Japan .....		1,069.90		10,211.27		320.00		11,601.17
David Bortnick .....	7/5	7/7	Honduras .....		556.00		1,794.00				2,350.00
	7/7	7/10	Panama .....		702.00		1,023.00				1,725.00
Hae (Jean) Kwon .....	8/1	8/24	Vietnam .....		1,653.14		14,511.00		464.75		16,628.89
Brad Allen .....	8/15	8/17	Germany .....		593.64		4,332.72				4,926.36
	8/17	8/18	Poland .....		156.41						156.41
	8/18	8/19	Belgium .....		270.00		399.96				669.96
	8/19	8/20	United Kingdom .....		369.07		309.68				678.75
Betsy Bina .....	8/15	8/17	Germany .....		593.64		4,332.72				4,926.36
	8/17	8/18	Poland .....		156.41						156.41
	8/18	8/19	Belgium .....		270.00		399.96				669.96
	8/19	8/20	United Kingdom .....		369.07		309.68				678.75
Shannon Richter .....	8/3	8/6	Thailand .....		802.76		9,405.06		138.27		10,346.09
	8/7	8/11	South Korea .....		904.18				1,798.00		2,702.18
Craig Higgins .....	8/24	8/24	Germany .....		296.99						296.99
	8/24	8/27	Ghana .....		918.00				912.60		1,830.60
	8/27	8/29	Senegal .....		821.00				192.90		1,013.90
	8/29	8/31	Italy .....		982.00				1,088.16		2,070.16
	8/31	9/1	Ireland .....		158.00		792.67		123.00		1,073.67
Erin Kolodjeski .....	8/24	8/24	Germany .....		296.99						296.99
	8/24	8/27	Ghana .....		918.00				912.60		1,830.60
	8/27	8/29	Senegal .....		821.00				192.90		1,013.90
	8/29	8/31	Italy .....		982.00				1,088.16		2,070.16
	8/31	9/1	Ireland .....		158.00		1,835.17		123.00		2,116.17
Jonathan Stivers .....	8/24	8/24	Germany .....		296.99						296.99
	8/24	8/27	Ghana .....		918.00				912.60		1,830.60
	8/27	8/29	Senegal .....		821.00				192.90		1,013.90
	8/29	8/31	Italy .....		982.00				1,088.16		2,070.16
	8/31	9/1	Ireland .....		158.00		1,800.17		123.00		2,081.17
Hayden Milberg .....	8/9	9/12	Germany .....		997.27		7,490.57				8,487.84
	8/12	8/14	Poland .....		485.52				360.14		845.66
	8/14	8/16	Estonia .....		508.72						508.72
	8/16	8/18	Latvia .....		422.75						422.75
Christopher Bigelow .....	8/24	8/25	Finland .....		357.00		1,166.06		69.38		1,592.44
	8/25	8/27	Norway .....		581.00		5,449.30		426.06		6,456.36
Jacquelynn Ripke .....	8/24	8/25	Finland .....		357.00		1,196.27		69.38		1,622.65
	8/25	8/27	Norway .....		581.00		5,449.31		426.06		6,456.37
Committee total .....					39,069.82		88,084.08		21,615.26		148,769.16

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.  
<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. ROSA L. DeLAURO, , 2022.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON ETHICS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 2022

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Ar- rival	Depar- ture		Foreign currency	U.S. dol- lar equiva- lent or U.S. cur- rency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dol- lar equiva- lent or U.S. cur- rency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dol- lar equiva- lent or U.S. cur- rency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dol- lar equiva- lent or U.S. cur- rency <sup>2</sup>

HOUSE COMMITTEES

Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return. ☒

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.  
<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. SUSAN WILD, Oct. 31, 2022.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2022

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Ar- rival	Depar- ture		Foreign currency	U.S. dol- lar equiva- lent or U.S. cur- rency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dol- lar equiva- lent or U.S. cur- rency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dol- lar equiva- lent or U.S. cur- rency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dol- lar equiva- lent or U.S. cur- rency <sup>2</sup>

HOUSE COMMITTEES

Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return. ☒

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.  
<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. MAXINE WATERS, Oct. 18, 2022.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2022

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Ar- ri- val	Depar- ture		Foreign currency	U.S. dol- lar equiva- lent or U.S. cur- rency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dol- lar equiva- lent or U.S. cur- rency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dol- lar equiva- lent or U.S. cur- rency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dol- lar equiva- lent or U.S. cur- rency <sup>2</sup>
Hon. Mike Turner .....	2/17	2/22	Europe .....	.....	1,377.43	.....	3,930.27	.....	1,284.94	.....	6,592.64
Hon. Jason Crow .....	2/17	2/22	Europe .....	.....	1,377.43	.....	3,930.27	.....	1,284.94	.....	6,592.64
Thomas Eager .....	2/19	2/26	Europe .....	.....	1,580.95	.....	9,164.87	.....	139.89	.....	10,885.71
Diana Pilipenko .....	2/19	2/26	Europe .....	.....	1,580.95	.....	9,164.87	.....	139.89	.....	10,885.71

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2022—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Hon. Jackie Speier .....	2/20	2/24	South America .....		999.40		7,995.17		733.39		9,727.96
David Cruz-Glaudemans .....	2/20	2/24	South America .....		999.40		8,803.37		733.40		10,536.17
Hon. Rick Crawford .....	2/20	2/24	Central America .....		761.52		1,330.44				2,091.96
Mandy Bowers .....	2/20	2/24	Central America .....		761.52		974.44				1,735.96
Kelsey Lax .....	2/20	2/24	Central America .....		761.52		974.44				1,735.96
Aaron Thurman .....	2/23	2/25	Central America .....		440.10		2,327.33		37.54		2,804.97
Ariana Rowberry .....	2/23	2/25	Central America .....		440.10		2,292.33		37.54		2,769.97
Hon. Sean Patrick Maloney ..	2/20	2/26	Europe .....		2,259.95		2,331.07		277.50		4,868.52
Matt Pylypciw .....	2/20	2/26	Europe .....		2,785.95		2,932.87		277.50		5,996.32
Sarah Istel .....	2/20	2/26	Europe .....		2,785.95		2,862.87		277.50		5,926.32
Hon. Eric Swalwell .....	3/20	3/26	Europe .....		1,371.36		14,236.77		1,060.27		16,668.40
Thomas Eager .....	3/20	3/26	Europe .....		1,366.62		8,686.47		1,060.27		11,113.36
Sarah Istel .....	3/20	3/26	Europe .....		4,441.36		8,686.47		1,060.27		14,188.10
Wells Bennett .....	3/20	3/26	Europe .....		1,371.36		10,266.07		1,060.28		12,697.71
Patrick Davis .....	3/20	3/26	Europe .....		1,371.36		8,686.47		1,060.28		11,118.11
Hon. Jim Himes .....	3/22	3/25	Europe .....		1,373.00		4,470.67		1,232.45		7,076.12
Hon. Sean Patrick Maloney ..	3/22	3/25	Europe .....		1,373.00		2,260.27		1,232.45		4,865.72
Kathy Suber .....	3/22	3/25	Europe .....		1,005.00		1,209.97		1,232.45		3,447.42
Amanda Rogers-Thorpe .....	3/22	3/25	Europe .....		1,005.00		839.67		1,232.46		3,077.13
Committee total .....					33,590.23		118,357.44		15,455.21		167,402.88

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. ADAM B. SCHIFF, Nov. 2, 2022.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

EC-6113. A letter from the Acting Executive Secretary, Agency for International Development, transmitting a notice of a nomination of a federal vacancy, and an action on nomination, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, Sec. 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

EC-6114. A letter from the Executive Secretary, Agency for International Development, transmitting three (3) notifications on a nomination of a federal vacancy, action on nomination, and discontinuation of service in acting role, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, Sec. 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

EC-6115. A letter from the Director, Congressional Affairs, Federal Election Commission, transmitting the Commission's Inspector General's Semiannual Report to Congress, from April 1, 2022, through September 30, 2022; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

EC-6116. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Maritime Commission, transmitting the Commission's Office of the Inspector General's Semiannual Report to Congress for the period April 1, 2022 through September 30, 2022, pursuant to section 5(b) of the Inspector General Act of 1978; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

EC-6117. A letter from the Public and Legislative Affairs Officer, Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board, transmitting the Board's Agency Financial Report, including the fiscal year 2022 financial statement audit, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3515(a)(1); Public Law 101-576, Sec. 303(a)(1) (as amended by Public Law 107-289, Sec. 2(a)); (116 Stat. 2049); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

EC-6118. A letter from the Chairman of the Board, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, Secretary of Labor, transmitting the Corporation's Office of Inspector General Semiannual Report to Congress; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DEFAZIO: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 7242. A bill to require the President to develop and maintain products that show the risk of natural hazards across the United States, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 117-609). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. DEFAZIO: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 7636. A bill to amend title 40, United States Code, to require the Administrator of General Services to procure the most life-cycle cost effective and energy efficient lighting products and to issue guidance on the efficiency, effectiveness, and economy of those products, and for other purposes (Rept. 117-610). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. DEFAZIO: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 7789. A bill to require the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency to establish a working group relating to best practices and Federal guidance for animals in emergencies and disasters, and for other purposes (Rept. 117-611). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House, on the state of the Union.

Mr. MEEKS: Committee on Foreign Affairs. House Resolution 1456. Resolution of inquiry requesting the President and directing the Secretary of State to transmit, respectively, certain documents to the House of Representatives relating to the conclusion of the Department of State on whether Marc Fogel is wrongfully detained, adversely (Rept. 117-612). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MEEKS: Committee on Foreign Affairs. House Resolution 1482. Resolution of inquiry requesting the President and directing the Secretary of Defense and Secretary of State to transmit, respectively, certain documents to the House of Representatives relating to Congressionally appropriated funds to the nation of Ukraine from January 20, 2021 to November 15, 2022, adversely (Rept. 117-613). Referred to the House Calendar.

## TIME LIMITATION OF REFERRED BILL

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XII, the following action was taken by the Speaker:

H.R. 4374. Referral to the Committee on Energy and Commerce extended for a period ending not later than December 15, 2022.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mrs. SEWELL (for herself, Mr. SMUCKER, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, and Mrs. MILLER of West Virginia):

H.R. 9462. A bill to establish the American Worker Retirement Plan, improve the financial security of working Americans by facilitating the accumulation of wealth, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. RODGERS of Washington (for herself and Mr. PALLONE):

H.R. 9463. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to provide authority for certain licenses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. PALLONE (for himself and Mrs. RODGERS of Washington):

H.R. 9464. A bill to amend the Secure and Trusted Communications Networks Act of 2019 to prohibit the Federal Communications Commission from granting a license or United States market access for a non-geostationary orbit satellite system if the license or grant of market access would be held or controlled by an entity that produces or provides any covered communications equipment or service or an affiliate of such an entity, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CASTRO of Texas:

H.R. 9465. A bill to provide locality pay to Federal employees working overseas under

domestic teleworking agreements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. CLYBURN:

H.R. 9466. A bill to require Community Development Block Grant and Surface Transportation Block Grant recipients to develop a strategy to support inclusive zoning policies, to allow for a credit to support housing affordability, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Financial Services, and Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. COHEN:

H.R. 9467. A bill to require the Federal Aviation Administration to establish evacuation standards for transport category airplanes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. DESAULNIER:

H.R. 9468. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to improve accessibility to, and completion of, postsecondary education for students, including students with disabilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. EMMER:

H.R. 9469. A bill to authorize a Mental Health Education Grant program to encourage students to pursue a career as a counselor, social worker, or therapist in an elementary or secondary school, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. FALLON (for himself, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. CLOUD, Mr. BERGMAN, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. JACKSON, Mrs. MCCLAIN, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. GOODEN of Texas, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. GREEN of Tennessee, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. CARTER of Texas, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. MAST, and Mr. TAYLOR):

H.R. 9470. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to clarify that expedited removal of inadmissible arriving aliens applies regardless of where the alien is encountered or apprehended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FOSTER (for himself and Ms. JOHNSON of Texas):

H.R. 9471. A bill to establish a Critical Materials Processing Technology Testbed Capability, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. GROTHMAN:

H.R. 9472. A bill to amend the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 to prohibit the use of supplemental nutrition assistance program benefits to purchase sugary beverages; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GUEST (for himself and Mr. TRONE):

H.R. 9473. A bill to require the Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection to regularly review and update policies and manuals related to inspections at ports of entry; to the Committee on Homeland Security, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. JAYAPAL (for herself, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. PANNETTA, Ms. BARRAGAN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. CHU, Mr. GARCIA of Illinois, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. JOHNSON

of Georgia, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. MENG, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. NORTON, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Ms. OMAR, and Ms. TLAIB):

H.R. 9474. A bill to extend immigration benefits to survivors of domestic violence, sexual assault, human trafficking, and other gender-based violence, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Agriculture, Education and Labor, Energy and Commerce, and Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. KIRKPATRICK (for herself, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. EVANS, Ms. JACOBS of California, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PETERS, Ms. PORTER, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. TITUS, Mr. TRONE, and Ms. WILSON of Florida):

H.R. 9475. A bill to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services, in consultation of the Secretary of Education, to conduct a study on the impact of COVID-19 on the mental health of education professionals, to direct the Secretary of Education to award grants to implement or improve health and wellness programs for education professionals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LARSEN of Washington (for himself, Ms. ROSS, Mr. BERA, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CARBAJAL, and Ms. BARRAGAN):

H.R. 9476. A bill to protect against seasonal and pandemic influenza, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on the Budget, and Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LOWENTHAL (for himself, Ms. MACE, Ms. PINGREE, and Ms. BROWNLEY):

H.R. 9477. A bill to authorize studies and pilot programs related to the development and production of aquaculture in the exclusive economic zone of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Education and Labor, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MCHENRY:

H.R. 9478. A bill to amend the Securities Act of 1933 to preempt State securities law requiring registration for secondary transactions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 9479. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to establish an educational assistance program to encourage the enlistment of persons in, and retention of members of, the District of Columbia National Guard by providing to certain such members financial assistance to attend undergraduate, vocational, or technical courses; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. O'HALLERAN:

H.R. 9480. A bill to ratify a Treaty between the San Juan Southern Paiute Tribe and the

Navajo Nation, to provide for the creation of a reservation for the San Juan Southern Paiute Tribe, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. PHILLIPS:

H.R. 9481. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a tax credit for new off-road plug-in electric vehicles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. PORTER (for herself, Mr. AGUILAR, Ms. TLAIB, Ms. NORTON, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, and Mr. DESAULNIER):

H.R. 9482. A bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to establish statewide community eligibility for certain special assistance payments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. STEFANIK (for herself, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. NEHLS, Mr. BALDERSON, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. FEENSTRA, Mrs. HINSON, Mr. MOORE of Alabama, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. EMMER, and Mrs. MILLER of Illinois):

H.R. 9483. A bill to amend the Agricultural Foreign Investment Disclosure Act of 1978 with respect to certain agricultural land transactions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia (for herself, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. JONES, Ms. SEWELL, and Mr. VEASEY):

H.R. 9484. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, and the Help America Vote Act of 2002 to improve procedures and requirements related to election mail; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MCNERNEY:

H.J. Res. 101. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States regarding the permissible sources of funding for elections for public office and State ballot measures; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Washington:

H. Con. Res. 121. Concurrent resolution directing the Clerk of the House of Representatives to make a correction in the enrollment of the bill H.R. 7776; considered and agreed to.

By Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ (for herself, Ms. BARRAGAN, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. GARCIA of Illinois, Ms. NEWMAN, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. CARDENAS, Mr. CARSON, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. SOTO, Mr. RUIZ, Ms. ROSS, Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. JAYAPAL, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. PORTER, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. BROWNLEY, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. ESCOBAR, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. STANSBURY, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mrs. TORRES of California, Ms. MENG, Ms. TITUS, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. SAN NICOLAS, Mr. LEVIN of California, Mr. CORREA, and Mr. GRIJALVA):

H. Con. Res. 122. Concurrent resolution recognizing the significance of equal pay and the disparity in wages paid to Latina women in comparison to men; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SMITH of Washington:

H. Res. 1512. A resolution providing for the concurrence by the House in the Senate amendment to H.R. 7776, with an amendment; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER (for himself and Ms. BONAMICI):

H. Res. 1513. A resolution commending and congratulating the Portland Thorns Football Club on winning the 2022 National Women's Soccer League championship; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia (for himself, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. KILMER, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia):

H. Res. 1514. A resolution raising awareness for the cancer chordoma; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. LIEU:

H. Res. 1515. A resolution expressing support for the draft United Nations General Assembly Resolution A/C.1/77/L.62 calling upon member states to commit not to conduct destructive direct-ascent anti-satellite missile tests, introduced by the United States at the 77th Session of the United Nations General Assembly; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

### CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Ms. SEWELL:

H.R. 9462.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mrs. RODGERS of Washington:

H.R. 9463.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 Clause III

By Mr. PALLONE:

H.R. 9464.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: [The Congress shall have Power] To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes

By Mr. CASTRO of Texas:

H.R. 9465.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. CLYBURN:

H.R. 9466.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. COHEN:

H.R. 9467.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. DESAULNIER:

H.R. 9468.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8.

By Mr. EMMER:

H.R. 9469.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I

By Mr. FALLON:

H.R. 9470.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8: "To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States."

By Mr. FOSTER:

H.R. 9471.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. GROTHMAN:

H.R. 9472.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. GUEST:

H.R. 9473.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Ms. JAYAPAL:

H.R. 9474.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mrs. KIRKPATRICK:

H.R. 9475.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

-Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. LARSEN of Washington:

H.R. 9476.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. LOWENTHAL:

H.R. 9477.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 8 of Article 1 of the Constitution

By Mr. MCHENRY:

H.R. 9478.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3:

To regulate commerce with states, other nations, and Native American tribes.

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18:

Authority to create laws that are necessary and proper to carry out the laws of the land (Necessary and Proper Clause)

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 9479.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

clauses 16, 17, and 18 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. O'HALLERAN:

H.R. 9480.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 18, section 8 of article 1 of the Constitution

By Mr. PHILLIPS:

H.R. 9481.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Under Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, Congress has the power to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Ms. PORTER:

H.R. 9482.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Ms. STEFANIK:

H.R. 9483.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8.

By Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia:

H.R. 9484.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. MCNERNEY:

H.J. Res. 101.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States grants Congress the authority to enact this bill.

### ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 481: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 1611: Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1735: Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, and Mr. VALADAO.

H.R. 2050: Ms. SPEIER, Mr. GOSAR, and Mr. KHANNA.

H.R. 2252: Mrs. RODGERS of Washington, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. WALBERG, and Ms. WEXTON.

H.R. 2549: Mrs. FLETCHER.

H.R. 2794: Ms. ROSS.

H.R. 2814: Mrs. FLETCHER.

H.R. 2820: Ms. MCCOLLUM and Ms. ROSS.

H.R. 3425: Mr. BRADY.

H.R. 3824: Mr. TAKANO.

H.R. 4433: Mrs. MCCLAIN.

H.R. 4647: Mr. GALLEGO.

H.R. 4690: Ms. CHU.

H.R. 4750: Ms. SLOTKIN.

H.R. 5029: Mr. GOLDEN.

H.R. 5227: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 5987: Mr. KIM of New Jersey.

H.R. 6129: Mr. MEIJER.

H.R. 6338: Mr. KIM of New Jersey.

H.R. 6405: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 6577: Mr. TORRES of New York.

H.R. 6843: Mrs. KIM of California and Mr. LEVIN of California.

H.R. 6860: Ms. STRICKLAND, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, and Mrs. DINGELL.

H.R. 7249: Mr. VARGAS and Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas.

H.R. 7382: Ms. STEFANIK.

H.R. 7499: Ms. MANNING.

H.R. 8371: Mr. FALLON.

H.R. 8406: Ms. MACE.

H.R. 8425: Mr. GOTTHEIMER.

H.R. 8528: Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana.

H.R. 8530: Mr. SEMPOLINSKI.

H.R. 8594: Mr. BOST.

H.R. 8616: Mr. KIM of New Jersey, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. CARTER of Louisiana, and Mr. MOOLENAAR.

H.R. 8637: Ms. SCANLON.

H.R. 8659: Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 8781: Mr. NORMAN.

H.R. 8970: Mr. GOTTHEIMER.

H.R. 9049: Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. BROWNLEY, Mr. VICENTE GONZALEZ of Texas, and Ms. SLOTKIN.

H.R. 9100: Ms. SCANLON.

H.R. 9125: Ms. MANNING.

H.R. 9141: Mrs. HINSON.

H.R. 9245: Mr. KILMER, Mr. CUELLAR, and Mr. THOMPSON of California.

H.R. 9247: Ms. KUSTER, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. CHU, and Mr. DESAULNIER.

H.R. 9270: Mr. GOOD of Virginia.



H.R. 9373: Mr. TIMMONS.  
H.R. 9388: Ms. BUSH.  
H.R. 9390: Ms. NORTON.  
H.R. 9429: Mr. BANKS.  
H.R. 9431: Mr. LIEU.  
H.R. 9449: Mr. KILDEE and Mr. CARTER of Georgia.  
H.R. 9455: Mr. LUETKEMEYER and Mr. LAHOOD.  
H.R. 9456: Mr. BUCK, Mr. NEHLS, Mr. PFLUGER, and Mr. NEWHOUSE.

H. Con. Res. 65: Mrs. STEEL.  
H. Res. 1481: Mr. GRIJALVA.

---

DISCHARGE PETITIONS—  
ADDITIONS AND WITHDRAWALS

The following Members added their names to the following discharge petitions:

Petition 8 by Mr. LONG on H.R. 3860: Mr. Buchanan.

Petition 12 by Mr. GOSAR on House Joint Resolution 46; Mr. Buchanan.

Petition 17 by Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois on House Resolution 1367: Mr. Ellzey.